Federal Office
for Information Security

Certification Report

BSI-DSZ-CC-0819-2012

for

STARCOS 3.5 ID SAC+EAC+AA C1

from

Giesecke & Devrient GmbH

BSI - Bundesamt für Sicherheit in der Informationstechnik, Postfach 20 03 63, D-53133 Bonn
Phone +49 (0)228 99 9582-0, Fax +49 (0)228 9582-5477, Infoline +49 (0)228 99 9582-111

Bundesamt
für Sicherheit in der
Informationstechnik

Deutsches IT-Sicherheitszertifikat

erteilt vom Bundesamt für Sicherheit in der Informationstechnik

BSI-DSZ-CC-0819-2012

Electronic ID documents: IC with Applications

STARCOS 3.5 ID SAC+EAC+AA C1

from	Giesecke & Devrient GmbH
PP Conformance:	Electronic Passport using Standard Inspection Procedure with PACE (ePass_PACE PP), Version 1.0, 2 November 2011, BSI-CC-PP-0068-V2-2011, Machine Readable Travel Document with "ICAO Application" Extended Access Control, Version 1.3, 10 February 2012, BSI-CC-PP-0056-V2-2012
Functionality:	PP conformant Common Criteria Part 2 extended
Assurance:	Common Criteria Part 3 conformant EAL 4 augmented by ALC_DVS.2, ATE_DPT.2 and AVA_VAN.5

Common Criteria Recognition Arrangement for components up to EAL 4

Common Criteria

The IT product identified in this certificate has been evaluated at an approved evaluation facility using the Common Methodology for IT Security Evaluation (CEM), Version 3.1 extended by advice of the Certification Body for components beyond EAL 5 and guidance specific for the technology of the product for conformance to the Common Criteria for IT Security Evaluation (CC), Version 3.1.

This certificate applies only to the specific version and release of the product in its evaluated configuration and in conjunction with the complete Certification Report.

The evaluation has been conducted in accordance with the provisions of the certification scheme of the German Federal Office for Information Security (BSI) and the conclusions of the evaluation facility in the evaluation technical report are consistent with the evidence adduced.

This certificate is not an endorsement of the IT product by the Federal Office for Information Security or any other organisation that recognises or gives effect to this certificate, and no warranty of the IT product by the Federal Office for Information Security or any other organisation that recognises or gives effect to this certificate, is either expressed or implied.

Bonn, 24 July 2012

For the Federal Office for Information Security

Bernd Kowalski
Head of Department

L.S.

SOGIS IT SECURITY CERTIFIED

Bundesamt für Sicherheit in der Informationstechnik
Godesberger Allee 185-189 - D-53175 Bonn - Postfach 20 03 63 - D-53133 Bonn
Phone +49 (0)228 99 9582-0 - Fax +49 (0)228 9582-5477 - Infoline +49 (0)228 99 9582-111

This page is intentionally left blank.

Preliminary Remarks

Under the BSIG[1] Act, the Federal Office for Information Security (BSI) has the task of issuing certificates for information technology products.

Certification of a product is carried out on the instigation of the vendor or a distributor, hereinafter called the sponsor.

A part of the procedure is the technical examination (evaluation) of the product according to the security criteria published by the BSI or generally recognised security criteria.

The evaluation is normally carried out by an evaluation facility recognised by the BSI or by BSI itself.

The result of the certification procedure is the present Certification Report. This report contains among others the certificate (summarised assessment) and the detailed Certification Results.

The Certification Results contain the technical description of the security functionality of the certified product, the details of the evaluation (strength and weaknesses) and instructions for the user.

[1] Act on the Federal Office for Information Security (BSI-Gesetz - BSIG) of 14 August 2009, Bundesgesetzblatt I p. 2821

Contents

A Certification

1 Specifications of the Certification Procedure

The certification body conducts the procedure according to the criteria laid down in the following:

- BSIG[2]
- BSI Certification Ordinance[3]
- BSI Schedule of Costs[4]
- Special decrees issued by the Bundesministerium des Innern (Federal Ministry of the Interior)
- DIN EN 45011 standard
- BSI certification: Procedural Description (BSI 7125) [3]
- Common Criteria for IT Security Evaluation (CC), Version 3.1[5] [1]
- Common Methodology for IT Security Evaluation, Version 3.1 [2]
- BSI certification: Application Notes and Interpretation of the Scheme (AIS) [4]

2 Recognition Agreements

In order to avoid multiple certification of the same product in different countries a mutual recognition of IT security certificates - as far as such certificates are based on ITSEC or CC - under certain conditions was agreed.

2.1 European Recognition of ITSEC/CC – Certificates (SOGIS-MRA)

The SOGIS-Mutual Recognition Agreement (SOGIS-MRA) Version 3 became effective in April 2010. It defines the recognition of certificates for IT-Products at a basic recognition level and in addition at higher recognition levels for IT-Products related to certain technical domains only.

The basic recognition level includes Common Criteria (CC) Evaluation Assurance Levels EAL1 to EAL4 and ITSEC Evaluation Assurance Levels E1 to E3 (basic). For higher recognition levels the technical domain Smart card and similar Devices has been defined. It includes assurance levels beyond EAL4 resp. E3 (basic). In Addition, certificates issued for Protection Profiles based on Common Criteria are part of the recognition agreement.

---

2 Act on the Federal Office for Information Security (BSI-Gesetz - BSIG) of 14 August 2009, Bundesgesetzblatt I p. 2821

3 Ordinance on the Procedure for Issuance of a Certificate by the Federal Office for Information Security (BSI-Zertifizierungsverordnung, BSIZertV) of 07 July 1992, Bundesgesetzblatt I p. 1230

4 Schedule of Cost for Official Procedures of the Bundesamt für Sicherheit in der Informationstechnik (BSI-Kostenverordnung, BSI-KostV) of 03 March 2005, Bundesgesetzblatt I p. 519

5 Proclamation of the Bundesministerium des Innern of 12 February 2007 in the Bundesanzeiger dated 23 February 2007, p. 3730

As of September 2011 the new agreement has been signed by the national bodies of Austria, Finland, France, Germany, Italy, The Netherlands, Norway, Spain, Sweden and the United Kingdom.Details on recognition and the history of the agreement can be found at https://www.bsi.bund.de/zertifizierung.

The SOGIS-MRA logo printed on the certificate indicates that it is recognised under the terms of this agreement by the nations listed above.

2.2 International Recognition of CC – Certificates (CCRA)

An arrangement (Common Criteria Recognition Arrangement) on the mutual recognition of certificates based on the CC Evaluation Assurance Levels up to and including EAL 4 has been signed in May 2000 (CCRA). It includes also the recognition of Protection Profiles based on the CC.

As of September 2011 the arrangement has been signed by the national bodies of: Australia, Austria, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, India, Israel, Italy, Japan, Republic of Korea, Malaysia, The Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Republic of Singapore, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States of America. The current list of signatory nations and approved certification schemes can be seen on the website: http://www.commoncriteriaportal.org.

The Common Criteria Recognition Arrangement logo printed on the certificate indicates that this certification is recognised under the terms of this agreement by the nations listed above.

This evaluation contains the components ALC_DVS.2, ATE_DPT.2 and AVA_VAN.5 that are not mutually recognised in accordance with the provisions of the CCRA. For mutual recognition the EAL4 components of these assurance families are relevant.

3 Performance of Evaluation and Certification

The certification body monitors each individual evaluation to ensure a uniform procedure, a uniform interpretation of the criteria and uniform ratings.

The product STARCOS 3.5 ID SAC+EAC+AA C1 has undergone the certification procedure at BSI.

The evaluation of the product STARCOS 3.5 ID SAC+EAC+AA C1 was conducted by SRC Security Research & Consulting GmbH. The evaluation was completed on 11 July 2012. The SRC Security Research & Consulting GmbH is an evaluation facility (ITSEF)[6] recognised by the certification body of BSI.

For this certification procedure the sponsor and applicant is: Giesecke & Devrient GmbH.

The product was developed by: Giesecke & Devrient GmbH.

The certification is concluded with the comparability check and the production of this Certification Report. This work was completed by the BSI.

4 Validity of the Certification Result

This Certification Report only applies to the version of the product as indicated. The confirmed assurance package is only valid on the condition that

[6] Information Technology Security Evaluation Facility

- all stipulations regarding generation, configuration and operation, as given in the following report, are observed,
- the product is operated in the environment described, as specified in the following report and in the Security Target.

For the meaning of the assurance levels please refer to the excerpts from the criteria at the end of the Certification Report.

The Certificate issued confirms the assurance of the product claimed in the Security Target at the date of certification. As attack methods evolve over time, the resistance of the certified version of the product against new attack methods needs to be re-assessed. Therefore, the sponsor shall apply for the certified product being monitored within the assurance continuity program of the BSI Certification Scheme (e.g. by a re-certification). Specifically, if results of the certification are used in subsequent evaluation and certification procedures, in a system integration process or if a user's risk management needs regularly updated results, it is recommended to perform a re-assessment on a regular e.g. annual basis.

In case of changes to the certified version of the product, the validity can be extended to the new versions and releases, provided the sponsor applies for assurance continuity (i.e. re-certification or maintenance) of the modified product, in accordance with the procedural requirements, and the evaluation does not reveal any security deficiencies.

5 Publication

The product STARCOS 3.5 ID SAC+EAC+AA C1 has been included in the BSI list of certified products, which is published regularly (see also Internet: https://www.bsi.bund.de and [5]). Further information can be obtained from BSI-Infoline +49 228 9582-111.

Further copies of this Certification Report can be requested from the developer[7] of the product. The Certification Report may also be obtained in electronic form at the internet address stated above.

B Certification Results

The following results represent a summary of

- the Security Target of the sponsor for the Target of Evaluation,
- the relevant evaluation results from the evaluation facility, and
- complementary notes and stipulations of the certification body.

[7] Giesecke & Devrient GmbH
Prinzregentenstr. 159
81677 München
Deutschland

1 Executive Summary

The Target of Evaluation (TOE) is the product STARCOS 3.5 ID SAC+EAC+AA C1 provided by Giesecke & Devrient GmbH, based on the hardware platform M7820 A11 by Infineon Technologies (Certificate-ID: BSI-DSZ-CC-0813-2012) [13]. The TOE is an electronic machine readable travel document (MRTD, or passport) representing a contactless smart card developed according to the Technical Guideline TR-03110, [15]; ICAO specification for Supplemental Access Control, [16] and ICAO specifications for electronically enabled passports, [17].

For CC evaluation the following applications of corresponding product will be considered:

- The ePassport Application containing the related user data (incl. Biometric data) as well as the data needed for authentication (incl. MRZ) as specified in [15] and [17], [18]; with this application the TOE is intended to be used as a machine readable travel document (MRTD)
- Guidance Documentation for the Personalization Phase,
- Guidance Documentation for the Usage Phase.

For details please see table 2 in chapter 2 of this report.

The TOE operating system does not include other applications than the ePassport application. Also, the GMA Verifier version 4.0 and its configuration file is part of the TOE. The Verifier is a configurable comparison tool for initialisation table images, which is used by the developer in order to verify the created initialisation table against the Generic Application Specification, [14]. The Verifier is not part of delivery to the user.

The generic application specification is implemented in the reference images, which are used with according configuration files with the Verifier to approve the correctness of developed initialisation tables. The GMA verifier is part of the TOE and has therefore been evaluated but it is not part of the delivery to the customer. It is used as a tool within the developer's environment.

The Security Target [6] and [7] is the basis for this certification. It is based on the certified Protection Profiles Electronic Passport using Standard Inspection Procedure with PACE (ePass_PACE PP), Version 1.0, 2 November 2011, BSI-CC-PP-0068-V2-2011, Machine Readable Travel Document with "ICAO Application" Extended Access Control, Version 1.3, 10 February 2012, BSI-CC-PP-0056-V2-2012 [9] and [10].

The TOE Security Assurance Requirements (SAR) are based entirely on the assurance components defined in Part 3 of the Common Criteria (see part C or [1], Part 3 for details). The TOE meets the assurance requirements of the Evaluation Assurance Level EAL 4 augmented by ALC_DVS.2, ATE_DPT.2 and AVA_VAN.5.

The TOE Security Functional Requirements (SFR) relevant for the TOE are outlined in the Security Target [6] and [7], chapter 6. They are selected from Common Criteria Part 2 and some of them are newly defined. Thus the TOE is CC Part 2 extended.

The TOE Security Functional Requirements are implemented by the following TOE Security Functionality:

Identifier	Addressed issue
SF_AccessControl	The TOE provides access control mechanisms that allow among others the maintenance

Identifier	Addressed issue
	of different users.
SF_Authentication	TSF-mediated actions on behalf of a user require the user's prior successful identification and authentication. After activation or reset of the TOE no user is authenticated.
SF_AssetProtection	The TOE supports the calculation of block check values for data integrity checking. The TOE hides information about IC power consumption and command execution time ensuring that no confidential information can be derived from this information.
SF_TSFProtection	The TOE is resistant to and detects physical tampering of the TSF.
SF_KeyManagement	The TOE supports onboard generation of cryptographic keys.

Table 1: TOE Security Functionality

For more details please refer to the Security Target [6] and [7], chapter 7.

The assets to be protected by the TOE are defined in the Security Target [6] and [7], chapter 3. Based on these assets the TOE Security Problem is defined in terms of Assumptions, Threats and Organisational Security Policies. This is outlined in the Security Target [6] and [7], chapter 3.

This certification covers the following configurations of the TOE: STARCOS 3.5 ID SAC+EAC+AA C1 provided by Giesecke & Devrient GmbH , configured as described in the Guidance Documents [11] and [12] provided with the TOE (for details refer to chapter 8).

The vulnerability assessment results as stated within this certificate do not include a rating for those cryptographic algorithms and their implementation suitable for encryption and decryption (see BSIG Section 9, Para. 4, Clause 2).

The certification results only apply to the version of the product indicated in the certificate and on the condition that all the stipulations are kept as detailed in this Certification Report. This certificate is not an endorsement of the IT product by the Federal Office for Information Security (BSI) or any other organisation that recognises or gives effect to this certificate, and no warranty of the IT product by BSI or any other organisation that recognises or gives effect to this certificate, is either expressed or implied.

2 Identification of the TOE

The Target of Evaluation (TOE) is called:

STARCOS 3.5 ID SAC+EAC+AA C1

The following table outlines the TOE deliverables:

No	Type	Identifier	Release	Form of Delivery
1	HW/SW	Initialised module with hardware for contactless interface. Hardware platform: M7820 A11 by Infineon Technologies (incl. its IC Dedicated Test Software) TOE Embedded Software: IC Embedded Software (the operating system) STARCOS 3.5 (implemented in ROM/EEPROM of the IC) TOE Embedded Applications: ePass – electronic passport application as initialisation table.	ROM Mask label CIF9DSCSR35-01c_V200 STARCOS version 3.5 TOE Embedded Application as initialisation table see text below	The IC and the Embedded Software are providing self-protection mechanisms, ensuring confidentiality and integrity during delivery. The delivery does not need additional security measures and can be considered as normal transport.
2	DOC	Guidance Documentation for the Personalization Phase STARCOS 3.3 ID EAC+AA C1 and STARCOS 3.5 ID SAC+EAC+AA C1 [11]	Version 2.2, Status 22.06.2012, filename: GDM_STA35_SAC+EAC+AA_C1_AGD_Personalisation_v22	Document in electronic form.
3	DOC	Guidance Documentation for the Usage Phase STARCOS 3.5 ID SAC+EAC+AA C1 [12]	Version 1.4, Status 21.03.2012, filename: GDM_STA35_SAC+EAC+AA_C1_AGD_UsagePhase_v14	Document in electronic form.
4	DOC	Correspondence between initialisation table and Common Criteria Evaluation, STARCOS 3.5 ID SAC+EAC+AA_C1 products [14]	n/a	Document in electronic form.

Table 2: Deliverables of the TOE

The customer specific ROM mask for the STARCOS 3.5 ID SAC+EAC+AA C1 on the hardware platform M7820 A11 is labelled CIF9DSCSR35-01c_V200.

The user is provided with guidance for TOE identification in [11]. The personalisation agent can use the ‘GET PROTOCOL DATA’ command (CLA = A0; INS = CA) to read out the chip information and identify of the ES embedded in the chip.

The following command parameters can be used to retrieve identification data:

Command parameters P1=’9F’ P2=’6B’, Identifier length 8 bytes, Description: Chip manufacturer data (Chip manufacturer’s ROM mask ID) varying in dependence on the used hardware (different non-volatile memory size).

Command parameters P1=’9F’ P2=’6A’, Identifier length 5 bytes, Description: Version of the operating system (OS-Manufacturer / OS version number / Version of ROM mask).

Command parameters P1=’9F’ P2=’67’, Identifier length 3 bytes, Description: Version of the completion level of the operating system and initialisation table.

Due to the type of the TOE, which is a MRTD, the version of the initialisation tables will be approved on the final product by help of the following method. The initialisation table implies the completion data; thereby the completion level can be uniquely identified during personalisation as presented in the list above. According to chapter 1.2 of [6] and [7], the developer provides a generic document [14] to the user (in this case: the user is the personalisation agent), which states the initialisation table identification in correspondence with the acquired Common Criteria certificate. [14] is individual for each initialisation table and each customer order and contains the following data for the user (i.e. the personalisation agent):

- a unique value, retrievable with the GET PROTOCOL DATA with tag 9F67 (last 16 bytes),
- the associated identifier with format CIFxDSCSI35-y-1201_Vzzz, with 'x' values for the non-volatie memory size of the TOE: 'A' for STARCOS 3.5 ID SAC+EAC+AA C1/800, 'B' for STARCOS 3.5 ID SAC+EAC+AA C1/360, '9' for STARCOS 3.5 ID SAC+EAC+AA C1/1280,
- 'y' values for communication protocol: 'A' for T=CL type A, 'B' for T=CL type B,
- 'zzz' values for consecutive number, where the range is fixed to 001-999,
- the correspondence with the certification ID.

All initialisation tables listed in document [14] have to pass a validation by the GMA Verifier. The functionality of the Verifier has been evaluated and tested as part of the evaluation.

Following are described the other identification values retrieved from the evaluated TOE configurations.

The initialisation and personalisation agent can use the ‘GET PROTOCOL DATA’ com-mand as described above to read out the chip information and identify the chip. The following list describes the evaluated configuration:

Chip manufacturer data (Chip manufacturer’s ROM mask ID) varying in dependence on the used hardware (different non-volatile memory size) for TOE STARCOS 3.5 ID SAC+EAC+AA C1/360, Identifier Data: 05 77 33 00 B1 00 8B 01; For TOE STARCOS 3.5 ID SAC+EAC+AA C1/800, Identifier Data: 05 77 33 00 A9 00 8A 01; For TOE STARCOS 3.5 ID SAC+EAC+AA C1/1280, Identifier Data: 05 77 33 00 A7 00 23 00.

Version of the operating system (OS-Manufacturer / OS version number / Version of ROM mask) for all TOE-HW configurations, Identifier Data: 47 44 00 B5 02.

Version of the completion level of the operating system and initialisation table for all TOE-HW configurations, Identifier Data: 02 01 01

The details to the above, such as the parameters and the command are described in more detail in sec 5.6.1 of [11].

3 Security Policy

The Security Policy is expressed by the set of Security Functional Requirements and implemented by the TOE. It is defined according to the Common Criteria Protection Profiles Electronic Passport using Standard Inspection Procedure with PACE

(ePass_PACE PP), Version 1.0, 10 November 2011, BSI-CC-PP-0068-V2-2011, and Machine Readable Travel Document with "ICAO Application" Extended Access Control, Version 1.3, 10 February 2012, BSI-CC-PP-0056-V2-2012.

4 Assumptions and Clarification of Scope

The Assumptions defined in the Security Target and some aspects of Threats and Organisational Security Policies are not covered by the TOE itself. These aspects lead to specific security objectives to be fulfilled by the TOE-Environment. The following topics are of relevance: OE.Auth_Key_Travel_Document, OE.Authoriz_Sens_Data, OE.Exam_Travel_Document, OE.Prot_Logical_Travel_Document, OE.Ext_Insp_Systems, OE.Legislative_Compliance, OE.Passive_Auth_Sign, OE.Personalisation, OE.Terminal, OE.Travel_Document_Holder, OE.Active_Auth_Key_Travel_Document. Details can be found in the Security Target [6] and [7], chapter 4.

5 Architectural Information

The TOE is a composite product. It is composed from an Integrated Circuit, IC Embedded Software and IC Application Software containing the ePassport Application. The IC Embedded software contains the operating system STARCOS 3.5. For details concerning the CC evaluation of the underlying IC see the evaluation documentation under the certification ID BSI-DSZ-CC-0813-2012.

According to the TOE Design the security functionality of the TOE are enforced by the following subsystems:

- System Library (contains the application framework)
- Runtime System (main loop and command interpreter)
- Chip Card Commands (pre-processor and processor of all implemented commands)
- Security Management (manages the security environment, security states and rule analysis)
- Key Management (search, pre-process, use and post-process of keys)
- Secure Messaging (SM handling)
- Crypto Functions (library with an API to all cryptographic operations)

6 Documentation

The evaluated documentation as outlined in table 2 is being provided with the product to the customer. This documentation contains the required information for secure usage of the TOE in accordance with the Security Target.

Additional obligations and notes for secure usage of the TOE as outlined in chapter 10 of this report have to be followed.

7 IT Product Testing

The developer tested all TOE Security Functionality either on real cards or with simulator tests. For all commands and functionality tests, test cases are specified in order to demonstrate its expected behaviour including error cases. Hereby a representative sample including all boundary values of the parameter set, e.g. all command APDUs with valid and

invalid inputs were tested and all functionality were tested with valid and invalid inputs. Repetition of developer tests were performed during the independent evaluator tests.

Since many Security Functionality can be tested by TR-03110 APDU command sequences, the evaluators performed these tests with real cards. This is considered to be a reasonable approach because the developer tests include a full coverage of all security functionality. Furthermore penetration tests were chosen by the evaluators for those Security Functionality where internal secrets of the card could maybe be modified or observed during testing. During their independent testing, the evaluators covered

- testing APDU commands related to Key Management and Crypto Functions,
- testing APDU commands related to NVM Management and File System,
- testing APDU commands related to Security Management,
- testing APDU commands related to Secure Messaging,
- testing APDU commands related to Runtime System and System Library,
- penetration testing related to verify the Reliability of the TOE,
- source code analysis performed by the evaluators,
- testing the commands which are used to execute the PACE protocol,
- side channel analysis for SHA, RSA and ECC (including ECC key generation),
- fault injection attacks (laser attacks),
- testing GMA Verifier
- testing APDU commands for the initialization, personalization and usage phase,
- testing APDU commands for the commands using cryptographic mechanisms,
- side channel analysis,
- fault injection tests.

The evaluators have tested the TOE systematically against high attack potential during their penetration testing.

The achieved test results correspond to the expected test results.

8 Evaluated Configuration

The TOE evaluated configuration is defined by the notation:

STARCOS 3.5 ID SAC+EAC+AA C1 on the hardware platform M7820 A11 and configured as described in the Generic SAC MRTD Application STARCOS 3.5 ID SAC+EAC+AA C1, [14] and as described in the Guidance Documents [11] and [12] provided with the TOE.

The initialisation and personalisation agent can use the ‘GET PROTOCOL DATA’ command as described in chapter 2 (above) to read out the chip information and identify the chip. The following information describes the evaluated configuration:

- Chip manufacturer data (Chip manufacturer’s ROM mask ID) varying in dependence on the used hardware (different non-volatile memory size) for TOE STARCOS 3.5 ID SAC+EAC+AA C1/360, Identifier Data: 05 77 33 00 B1 00 8B 01; For TOE STARCOS

3.5 ID SAC+EAC+AA C1/800, Identifier Data: 05 77 33 00 A9 00 8A 01; For TOE STARCOS 3.5 ID SAC+EAC+AA C1/1280, Identifier Data: 05 77 33 00 A7 00 23 00;

- Version of the operating system (OS-Manufacturer / OS version number / Version of ROM mask), Identifier Data: 47 44 00 B5 02;
- Version of the completion level of the operating system and initialisation table, Identifier Data: 02 01 01.

9 Results of the Evaluation

9.1 CC specific results

The Evaluation Technical Report (ETR) [8] was provided by the ITSEF according to the Common Criteria [1], the Methodology [2], the requirements of the Scheme [3] and all interpretations and guidelines of the Scheme (AIS) [4] as relevant for the TOE.

The Evaluation Methodology CEM [2] was used for those components up to EAL4 extended by advice of the Certification Body for components beyond EAL 4 and guidance specific for the technology of the product [4] (AIS 34).

The following guidance specific for the technology was used:

- The Application of CC to Integrated Circuits,
- Application of Attack Potential to Smartcards,
- Public Version of Security Targets (ST-Lite) including JIL Document and CC Supporting Document and CCRA policies
- Composite product evaluation for Smart Cards and similar devices ([4], AIS 36). According to this concept the relevant guidance documents of the underlying platform and the documents ETR for Composition from the platform evaluations (i.e. on hardware [13, 20] have been applied in the TOE evaluation.

(see [4], AIS 25, AIS 26, AIS 35).

For RNG assessment the scheme interpretations AIS 20 was used (see [4]).

As a result of the evaluation the verdict PASS is confirmed for the following assurance components:

- All components of the EAL 4 package including the class ASE as defined in the CC (see also part C of this report)
- The components ALC_DVS.2, ATE_DPT.2 and AVA_VAN.5 augmented for this TOE evaluation.

The evaluation has confirmed:

- PP Conformance: Electronic Passport using Standard Inspection Procedure with PACE (ePass_PACE PP), Version 1.0, 2 November 2011, BSI-CC-PP-0068-V2-2011, Machine Readable Travel Document with "ICAO Application" Extended Access Control, Version 1.3, 10 February 2012, BSI-CC-PP-0056-V2-2012 [10], [11]
- for the Functionality: PP conformant
  Common Criteria Part 2 extended
- for the Assurance: Common Criteria Part 3 conformant / extended
  EAL 4 augmented by ALC_DVS.2, ATE_DPT.2 and AVA_VAN.5

For specific evaluation results regarding the development and production environment see annex B in part D of this report.

The results of the evaluation are only applicable to the TOE as defined in chapter 2 and the configuration as outlined in chapter 8 above.

9.2 Results of cryptographic assessment

The following cryptographic algorithms are used by STARCOS 3.5 ID SAC+EAC+AA C1 to enforce its security policy:

Algorithm	Bit Length	Purpose	Security Functionality	Standard of Implementation	Standard of Usage
ECDH	112, 128, 192, 256	Diffie-Hellman Keys for PACE	Cryptographic key gener-ation – Diffie-Hellman for PACE session keys (FCS_CKM.1/DH_PACE)	TR-03111	[16]
ECDH	112, 128, 192, 256	Diffie-Hellman Keys for Chip Authentication	Cryptographic key generation – Diffie-Hellman for Chip Authentication session keys (FCS_CKM.1/CA)	ISO 15946, TR-03111	[16]
EC Key generation	224, 256, 320, 384, 512, 521	EC Keys for Chip Authentication	Cryptographic key generation –Chip Authentication key pair (FCS_CKM.1/CAPK)		TR-03110, Appendix A.4
RSA Key generation	2048-4096	RSA key for Active Authentication	Cryptographic key generation – Active Authentication key pair (FCS_CKM.1/AAPK)		[17], chapter 8.2
TDES or AES	112, 128, 192, 256	112, 128, 192, 256	Cryptographic operation – Encryption / Decryption AES/3DES (FCS_COP.1/PACE_ENC)	FIPS PUB 46-3 or FIPS PUB 197 respectively	[16]
CMAC or Re-tail-MAC	112, 128, 192, 256	Secure Messaging message authentication code	Cryptographic operation – MAC after PACE (FCS_COP.1/PACE_MAC)	NIST-800-38B or ISO/IEC 9797-1 respectively	[16]
TDES or AES	112, 128, 192, 256	Secure Messaging	Cryptographic operation – Symmetric Encryption / Decryption (FCS_COP.1/CA_ENC)	NIST-800-38B or ISO/IEC 9797-1 respectively	[16]
CMAC or Re-tail-MAC	112, 128, 192, 256	Secure Messaging message authentication code	Cryptographic operation – MAC after CA (FCS_COP.1/CA_MAC)	NIST-800-38B or ISO/IEC 9797-1 respectively	[16]
ECDSA	192-521	Signature Verification during Terminal Authentication	Cryptographic operation – Signature verification by travel document (FSC_COP.1/SIG_VER)	TR-03111	[16]
RSA	1024-4096	Signature generation during Active Authentication	Cryptographic operation – Signature generation for AA (FCS_COP.1/RSA_MRTD)	ISO/IEC 9796-2:2002, chapter 8	[16]

Table 3: **Cryptographic Algorithms used by the TOE**

All cryptographic algorithms listed in table 3 are implemented by the TOE because of the standards building the TOE application (e.g. TR-03110 [15]). For that reason an explicit validity period is not given.

The strength of the cryptographic algorithms was not rated in the course of this certification procedure (see BSIG Section 9, Para. 3, Clause 2). According to Technical Guideline BSI-TR-03110, Version 2.05 [15], the algorithms are suitable for securing integrity, authenticity and confidentiality of the stored data for Electronic Identity Cards.

10 Obligations and Notes for the Usage of the TOE

The documents as outlined in table 2 contain necessary information about the usage of the TOE and all security hints therein have to be considered. In addition all aspects of Assumptions, Threats and OSPs as outlined in the Security Target not covered by the TOE itself need to be fulfilled by the operational environment of the TOE.

The customer or user of the product shall consider the results of the certification within his system risk management process. In order for the evolution of attack methods and techniques to be covered, he should define the period of time until a re-assessment for the TOE is required and thus requested from the sponsor of the certificate.

11 Security Target

For the purpose of publishing, the Security Target [7] of the Target of Evaluation (TOE) is provided within a separate document as Annex A of this report. It is a sanitised version of the complete Security Target [6] used for the evaluation performed. Sanitisation was performed according to the rules as outlined in the relevant CCRA policy (see AIS 35 [4]).

12 Definitions

12.1 Acronyms

AA Active Authentication

AES Advanced Encryption Standard

APDU Application Protocol Data Unit

AIS Application Notes and Interpretations of the Scheme

BSI Bundesamt für Sicherheit in der Informationstechnik / Federal Office for Information Security, Bonn, Germany

BSIG BSI-Gesetz / Act on the Federal Office for Information Security

CCRA Common Criteria Recognition Arrangement

CC Common Criteria for IT Security Evaluation

CEM Common Methodology for Information Technology Security Evaluation

CMAC Cipher-based message authentication code algorithm

EAC Extended Access Control

EAL Evaluation Assurance Level

EC	Elliptic Curve
ECC	Elliptic Curve Cryptography
ECDH	Elliptic Curve Diffie-Hellman
ECDSA	Elliptic Curve Digital Signature Algorithm
EEPROM	Electrically Erasable Programmable Read-Only Memory
eID	Electronic Identity Card
GMA	Generic MRTD Application
IC	Integrated Circuit
ICAO	International Civil Aviation Organisation
ID_Card	Identity Card
IT	Information Technology
ITSEC	Information Technology Security Evaluation Criteria
ITSEF	Information Technology Security Evaluation Facility
MRTD	Machine readable travel document
MRZ	Machine readable zone
PACE	Password Authenticated Connection Establishment
PP	Protection Profile
ROM	Read Only Memory
SAC	Supplemental Access Control
SAR	Security Assurance Requirement
SFP	Security Function Policy
SFR	Security Functional Requirement
ST	Security Target
TOE	Target of Evaluation
TSF	TOE Security Functionality

12.2 Glossary

Augmentation - The addition of one or more requirement(s) to a package.

Extension - The addition to an ST or PP of functional requirements not contained in part 2 and/or assurance requirements not contained in part 3 of the CC.

Formal - Expressed in a restricted syntax language with defined semantics based on well-established mathematical concepts.

Informal - Expressed in natural language.

Object - An passive entity in the TOE, that contains or receives information, and upon which subjects perform operations.

Protection Profile - An implementation-independent statement of security needs for a TOE type.

Security Target - An implementation-dependent statement of security needs for a specific identified TOE.

Semiformal - Expressed in a restricted syntax language with defined semantics.

Subject - An active entity in the TOE that performs operations on objects.

Target of Evaluation - A set of software, firmware and/or hardware possibly accompanied by guidance.

TOE Security Functionality - combined functionality of all hardware, software, and firmware of a TOE that must be relied upon for the correct enforcement of the SFRs

13 Bibliography

[1] Common Criteria for Information Technology Security Evaluation, Version 3.1,
Part 1: Introduction and general model, Revision 3, July 2009
Part 2: Security functional components, Revision 3, July 2009
Part 3: Security assurance components, Revision 3, July 2009

[2] Common Methodology for Information Technology Security Evaluation (CEM), Evaluation Methodology, Version 3.1, Rev. 3, July 2009

[3] BSI certification: Procedural Description (BSI 7125)

[4] Application Notes and Interpretations of the Scheme (AIS) as relevant for the TOE[8].

[5] German IT Security Certificates (BSI 7148), periodically updated list published also in the BSI Website

[6] Security Target BSI-DSZ-CC-0819-2012, STARCOS 3.5 ID SAC+EAC+AA C1 Security Target, Giesecke & Devrient GmbH, Version 2.2, 10.07.2012 (confidential document)

[7] Security Target BSI-DSZ-CC-0819-2012, STARCOS 3.5 ID SAC+EAC+AA C1 Security Target Lite, Giesecke & Devrient GmbH, Version 2.2, 10.07.2012, (sanitised public document)

[8] Evaluation Technical Report (ETR), Product: STARCOS 3.5 ID SAC+EAC+AA C1, Certification ID: BSI-DSZ-CC-0819, Version 1.1, Date: 11.07.2012, Evaluation Facility: SRC Security Research & Consulting GmbH (confidential document)

[9] Protection Profile Electronic Passport using Standard Inspection Procedure with PACE (ePass_PACE PP), Version 1.0, 10 November 2011, BSI-CC-PP-0068-V2-2011

[10] Protection Profile Machine Readable Travel Document with "ICAO Application" Extended Access Control, Version 1.3, 10 February 2012, BSI-CC-PP-0056-V2-2012

[11] Guidance Documentation for the Personalization Phase STARCOS 3.3 ID EAC+AA C1 and STARCOS 3.5 ID SAC+EAC+AA C1, Version 2.2 / Status 22.06.2012

---

[8] specifically

- AIS 20, Version 2, Funktionalitätsklassen und Evaluationsmethodologie für deterministische Zufallszahlengeneratoren
- AIS 25, Version 7, Anwendung der CC auf Integrierte Schaltungen including JIL Document and CC Supporting Document
- AIS 26, Version 8, Evaluationsmethodologie für in Hardware integrierte Schaltungen including JIL Document and CC Supporting Document
- AIS 32, Version 7, CC-Interpretationen im deutschen Zertifizierungsschema
- AIS 34, Version 3, Evaluation Methodology for CC Assurance Classes for EAL5+ (CCv2.3 & CCv3.1) and EAL6 (CCv3.1)
- AIS 35, Version 2.0, Öffentliche Fassung des Security Targets (ST-Lite) including JIL Document and CC Supporting Document and CCRA policies
- AIS 36, Version 3, Kompositionsevaluierung including JIL Document and CC Supporting Document
- AIS 38, Version 2.9, Reuse of evaluation results

[12] Guidance Documentation for the Usage Phase STARCOS 3.5 ID SAC+EAC+AA C1, Version 1.4/Status 21.03.2012

[13] Certification Report for BSI-DSZ-CC-0813-2012 for Infineon smart card IC (Security Controller) M7820 A11 with optional RSA2048/4096 v1.02.008, EC v1.02.008, SHA-2 v1.01 and Toolbox v1.02.008 libraries and with specific IC dedicated software, 6 June 2012 from Infineon Technologies AG

[14] STARCOS 3.5 ID TABLES, Giesecke & Devrient, Correspondence between initialisation table and Common Criteria Evaluation, STARCOS 3.5 ID SAC+EAC+AA_C1 products

[15] Technical Guideline TR-03110 Advanced Security Mechanisms for Machine Readable Travel Documents – Extended Access Control (EAC), TR-03110, Version 2.05, 14.10.2010, Bundesamt für Sicherheit in der Informationstechnik (BSI)

[16] International Civil Aviation Organization, ICAO Machine Readable Travel Documents, Technical Report, Supplemental Access Control for Machine Readable Travel Documents, Version 1.01, November 2010

[17] ICAO Doc 9303-1, Specifications for electronically enabled passports with biometric identification capabilities. In Machine Readable Travel Documents – Part 1: Machine Readable Passport, volume 2, ICAO, 6th edition, 2006

[18] ICAO Doc 9303-3, Specifications for electronically enabled official travel documents with biometric identification capabilities. In Machine Readable Travel Documents - Part 3: Machine Readable Official Travel Documents, volume 2, ICAO, 3rd edition, 2008

[19] International Civil Aviation Organization, ICAO Machine Readable Travel Documents, Technical Report, Supplemental Access Control for Machine Readable Travel Documents, Version 1.01, November 2010

[20] ETR for composition according to AIS36, M7820 A11, BSI-DSZ-CC-0813, Version 1, 1 June 2012, TÜV Informationstechnik GmbH (confidential document)

C Excerpts from the Criteria

CC Part1:

Conformance Claim (chapter 10.4)

“The conformance claim indicates the source of the collection of requirements that is met by a PP or ST that passes its evaluation. This conformance claim contains a CC conformance claim that:

- describes the version of the CC to which the PP or ST claims conformance.
- describes the conformance to CC Part 2 (security functional requirements) as either:
  - **CC Part 2 conformant** - A PP or ST is CC Part 2 conformant if all SFRs in that PP or ST are based only upon functional components in CC Part 2, or
  - **CC Part 2 extended** - A PP or ST is CC Part 2 extended if at least one SFR in that PP or ST is not based upon functional components in CC Part 2.
- describes the conformance to CC Part 3 (security assurance requirements) as either:
  - **CC Part 3 conformant** - A PP or ST is CC Part 3 conformant if all SARs in that PP or ST are based only upon assurance components in CC Part 3, or
  - CC Part 3 extended - A PP or ST is CC Part 3 extended if at least one SAR in that PP or ST is not based upon assurance components in CC Part 3.

Additionally, the conformance claim may include a statement made with respect to packages, in which case it consists of one of the following:

- Package name Conformant - A PP or ST is conformant to a pre-defined package (e.g. EAL) if:
  - the SFRs of that PP or ST are identical to the SFRs in the package, or
  - the SARs of that PP or ST are identical to the SARs in the package.
- Package name Augmented - A PP or ST is an augmentation of a predefined package if:
  - the SFRs of that PP or ST contain all SFRs in the package, but have at least one additional SFR or one SFR that is hierarchically higher than an SFR in the package.
  - the SARs of that PP or ST contain all SARs in the package, but have at least one additional SAR or one SAR that is hierarchically higher than an SAR in the package.

Note that when a TOE is successfully evaluated to a given ST, any conformance claims of the ST also hold for the TOE. A TOE can therefore also be e.g. CC Part 2 conformant.

Finally, the conformance claim may also include two statements with respect to Protection Profiles:

- PP Conformant - A PP or TOE meets specific PP(s), which are listed as part of the conformance result.
- Conformance Statement (Only for PPs) - This statement describes the manner in which PPs or STs must conform to this PP: strict or demonstrable. For more information on this Conformance Statement, see Annex D.”

CC Part 3:

Class APE: Protection Profile evaluation (chapter 10)

“Evaluating a PP is required to demonstrate that the PP is sound and internally consistent, and, if the PP is based on one or more other PPs or on packages, that the PP is a correct instantiation of these PPs and packages. These properties are necessary for the PP to be suitable for use as the basis for writing an ST or another PP.

Assurance Class	Assurance Components
Class APE: Protection Profile evaluation	APE_INT.1 PP introduction
	APE_CCL.1 Conformance claims
	APE_SPD.1 Security problem definition
	APE_OBJ.1 Security objectives for the operational environment APE_OBJ.2 Security objectives
	APE_ECD.1 Extended components definition
	APE_REQ.1 Stated security requirements APE_REQ.2 Derived security requirements

APE: Protection Profile evaluation class decomposition”

Class ASE: Security Target evaluation (chapter 11)

“Evaluating an ST is required to demonstrate that the ST is sound and internally consistent, and, if the ST is based on one or more PPs or packages, that the ST is a correct instantiation of these PPs and packages. These properties are necessary for the ST to be suitable for use as the basis for a TOE evaluation.”

Assurance Class	Assurance Components
Class ASE: Security Target evaluation	ASE_INT.1 ST introduction
	ASE_CCL.1 Conformance claims
	ASE_SPD.1 Security problem definition
	ASE_OBJ.1 Security objectives for the operational environment ASE_OBJ.2 Security objectives
	ASE_ECD.1 Extended components definition
	ASE_REQ.1 Stated security requirements ASE_REQ.2 Derived security requirements
	ASE_TSS.1 TOE summary specification ASE_TSS.2 TOE summary specification with architectural design summary

ASE: Security Target evaluation class decomposition

Security assurance components (chapter 7)

“The following Sections describe the constructs used in representing the assurance classes, families, and components.“
“Each assurance class contains at least one assurance family.”
“Each assurance family contains one or more assurance components.”

The following table shows the assurance class decomposition.

Assurance Class	Assurance Components
ADV: Development	ADV_ARC.1 Security architecture description
	ADV_FSP.1 Basic functional specification ADV_FSP.2 Security-enforcing functional specification ADV_FSP.3 Functional specification with complete summary ADV_FSP.4 Complete functional specification ADV_FSP.5 Complete semi-formal functional specification with additional error information ADV_FSP.6 Complete semi-formal functional specification with additional formal specification
	ADV_IMP.1 Implementation representation of the TSF ADV_IMP.2 Implementation of the TSF
	ADV_INT.1 Well-structured subset of TSF internals ADV_INT.2 Well-structured internals ADV_INT.3 Minimally complex internals
	ADV_SPM.1 Formal TOE security policy model
	ADV_TDS.1 Basic design ADV_TDS.2 Architectural design ADV_TDS.3 Basic modular design ADV_TDS.4 Semiformal modular design ADV_TDS.5 Complete semiformal modular design ADV_TDS.6 Complete semiformal modular design with formal high-level design presentation

Assurance Class	Assurance Components
AGD: Guidance documents	AGD_OPE.1 Operational user guidance
	AGD_PRE.1 Preparative procedures
ALC: Life cycle support	ALC_CMC.1 Labelling of the TOE ALC_CMC.2 Use of a CM system ALC_CMC.3 Authorisation controls ALC_CMC.4 Production support, acceptance procedures and automation ALC_CMC.5 Advanced support
	ALC_CMS.1 TOE CM coverage ALC_CMS.2 Parts of the TOE CM coverage ALC_CMS.3 Implementation representation CM coverage ALC_CMS.4 Problem tracking CM coverage ALC_CMS.5 Development tools CM coverage
	ALC_DEL.1 Delivery procedures
	ALC_DVS.1 Identification of security measures ALC_DVS.2 Sufficiency of security measures
	ALC_FLR.1 Basic flaw remediation ALC_FLR.2 Flaw reporting procedures ALC_FLR.3 Systematic flaw remediation
	ALC_LCD.1 Developer defined life-cycle model ALC_LCD.2 Measurable life-cycle model
	ALC_TAT.1 Well-defined development tools ALC_TAT.2 Compliance with implementation standards ALC_TAT.3 Compliance with implementation standards - all parts
ATE: Tests	ATE_COV.1 Evidence of coverage ATE_COV.2 Analysis of coverage ATE_COV.3 Rigorous analysis of coverage
	ATE_DPT.1 Testing: basic design ATE_DPT.2 Testing: security enforcing modules ATE_DPT.3 Testing: modular design ATE_DPT.4 Testing: implementation representation
	ATE_FUN.1 Functional testing ATE_FUN.2 Ordered functional testing
	ATE_IND.1 Independent testing – conformance ATE_IND.2 Independent testing – sample ATE_IND.3 Independent testing – complete
AVA: Vulnerability assessment	AVA_VAN.1 Vulnerability survey AVA_VAN.2 Vulnerability analysis AVA_VAN.3 Focused vulnerability analysis AVA_VAN.4 Methodical vulnerability analysis AVA_VAN.5 Advanced methodical vulnerability analysis

Assurance class decomposition

Evaluation assurance levels (chapter 8)

“The Evaluation Assurance Levels (EALs) provide an increasing scale that balances the level of assurance obtained with the cost and feasibility of acquiring that degree of assurance. The CC approach identifies the separate concepts of assurance in a TOE at the end of the evaluation, and of maintenance of that assurance during the operational use of the TOE.

It is important to note that not all families and components from CC Part 3 are included in the EALs. This is not to say that these do not provide meaningful and desirable assurances. Instead, it is expected that these families and components will be considered for augmentation of an EAL in those PPs and STs for which they provide utility.”

Evaluation assurance level (EAL) overview (chapter 8.1)

“Table 1 represents a summary of the EALs. The columns represent a hierarchically ordered set of EALs, while the rows represent assurance families. Each number in the resulting matrix identifies a specific assurance component where applicable.

As outlined in the next Section, seven hierarchically ordered evaluation assurance levels are defined in the CC for the rating of a TOE's assurance. They are hierarchically ordered inasmuch as each EAL represents more assurance than all lower EALs. The increase in assurance from EAL to EAL is accomplished by substitution of a hierarchically higher assurance component from the same assurance family (i.e. increasing rigour, scope, and/or depth) and from the addition of assurance components from other assurance families (i.e. adding new requirements).

These EALs consist of an appropriate combination of assurance components as described in Chapter 7 of this CC Part 3. More precisely, each EAL includes no more than one component of each assurance family and all assurance dependencies of every component are addressed.

While the EALs are defined in the CC, it is possible to represent other combinations of assurance. Specifically, the notion of “augmentation” allows the addition of assurance components (from assurance families not already included in the EAL) or the substitution of assurance components (with another hierarchically higher assurance component in the same assurance family) to an EAL. Of the assurance constructs defined in the CC, only EALs may be augmented. The notion of an “EAL minus a constituent assurance component” is not recognised by the standard as a valid claim. Augmentation carries with it the obligation on the part of the claimant to justify the utility and added value of the added assurance component to the EAL. An EAL may also be augmented with extended assurance requirements.

Assurance Class	Assurance Family	Assurance Components by Evaluation Assurance Level						
		EAL1	EAL2	EAL3	EAL4	EAL5	EAL6	EAL7
Development	ADV_ARC		1	1	1	1	1	1
	ADV_FSP	1	2	3	4	5	5	6
	ADV_IMP				1	1	2	2
	ADV_INT					2	3	3
	ADV_SPM						1	1
	ADV_TDS		1	2	3	4	5	6
Guidance Documents	AGD_OPE	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	AGD_PRE	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Life cycle Support	ALC_CMC	1	2	3	4	4	5	5
	ALC_CMS	1	2	3	4	5	5	5
	ALC_DEL		1	1	1	1	1	1
	ALC_DVS			1	1	1	2	2
	ALC_FLR							
	ALC_LCD			1	1	1	1	2
	ALC_TAT				1	2	3	3
Security Target Evaluation	ASE_CCL	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	ASE_ECD	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	ASE_INT	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	ASE_OBJ	1	2	2	2	2	2	2
	ASR_REQ	1	2	2	2	2	2	2
	ASE_SPD		1	1	1	1	1	1
	ASE_TSS	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Tests	ATE_COV		1	2	2	2	3	3
	ATE_DPT			1	1	3	3	4
	ATE_FUN		1	1	1	1	2	2
	ATE_IND	1	2	2	2	2	2	3
Vulnerability assessment	AVA_VAN	1	2	2	3	4	5	5

Table 1: Evaluation assurance level summary”

Evaluation assurance level 1 (EAL1) - functionally tested (chapter 8.3)

“Objectives

EAL1 is applicable where some confidence in correct operation is required, but the threats to security are not viewed as serious. It will be of value where independent assurance is required to support the contention that due care has been exercised with respect to the protection of personal or similar information.

EAL1 requires only a limited security target. It is sufficient to simply state the SFRs that the TOE must meet, rather than deriving them from threats, OSPs and assumptions through security objectives.

EAL1 provides an evaluation of the TOE as made available to the customer, including independent testing against a specification, and an examination of the guidance documentation provided. It is intended that an EAL1 evaluation could be successfully conducted without assistance from the developer of the TOE, and for minimal outlay.

An evaluation at this level should provide evidence that the TOE functions in a manner consistent with its documentation.”

Evaluation assurance level 2 (EAL2) - structurally tested (chapter 8.4)

“Objectives

EAL2 requires the co-operation of the developer in terms of the delivery of design information and test results, but should not demand more effort on the part of the developer than is consistent with good commercial practise. As such it should not require a substantially increased investment of cost or time.

EAL2 is therefore applicable in those circumstances where developers or users require a low to moderate level of independently assured security in the absence of ready availability of the complete development record. Such a situation may arise when securing legacy systems, or where access to the developer may be limited.”

Evaluation assurance level 3 (EAL3) - methodically tested and checked (chapter 8.5)

“Objectives

EAL3 permits a conscientious developer to gain maximum assurance from positive security engineering at the design stage without substantial alteration of existing sound development practises.

EAL3 is applicable in those circumstances where developers or users require a moderate level of independently assured security, and require a thorough investigation of the TOE and its development without substantial re-engineering.”

Evaluation assurance level 4 (EAL4) - methodically designed, tested, and reviewed (chapter 8.6)

“Objectives

EAL4 permits a developer to gain maximum assurance from positive security engineering based on good commercial development practises which, though rigorous, do not require substantial specialist knowledge, skills, and other resources. EAL4 is the highest level at which it is likely to be economically feasible to retrofit to an existing product line.

EAL4 is therefore applicable in those circumstances where developers or users require a moderate to high level of independently assured security in conventional commodity TOEs and are prepared to incur additional security-specific engineering costs.”

Evaluation assurance level 5 (EAL5) - semiformally designed and tested (chapter 8.7)

“Objectives

EAL5 permits a developer to gain maximum assurance from security engineering based upon rigorous commercial development practises supported by moderate application of specialist security engineering techniques. Such a TOE will probably be designed and developed with the intent of achieving EAL5 assurance. It is likely that the additional costs attributable to the EAL5 requirements, relative to rigorous development without the application of specialised techniques, will not be large.

EAL5 is therefore applicable in those circumstances where developers or users require a high level of independently assured security in a planned development and require a rigorous development approach without incurring unreasonable costs attributable to specialist security engineering techniques.”

Evaluation assurance level 6 (EAL6) - semiformally verified design and tested (chapter 8.8)

“Objectives

EAL6 permits developers to gain high assurance from application of security engineering techniques to a rigorous development environment in order to produce a premium TOE for protecting high value assets against significant risks.

EAL6 is therefore applicable to the development of security TOEs for application in high risk situations where the value of the protected assets justifies the additional costs.”

Evaluation assurance level 7 (EAL7) - formally verified design and tested (chapter 8.9)

“Objectives

EAL7 is applicable to the development of security TOEs for application in extremely high risk situations and/or where the high value of the assets justifies the higher costs. Practical application of EAL7 is currently limited to TOEs with tightly focused security functionality that is amenable to extensive formal analysis.”

Class AVA: Vulnerability assessment (chapter 16)

“The AVA: Vulnerability assessment class addresses the possibility of exploitable vulnerabilities introduced in the development or the operation of the TOE.”

Vulnerability analysis (AVA_VAN) (chapter 16.1)

"Objectives

Vulnerability analysis is an assessment to determine whether potential vulnerabilities identified, during the evaluation of the development and anticipated operation of the TOE or by other methods (e.g. by flaw hypotheses or quantitative or statistical analysis of the security behaviour of the underlying security mechanisms), could allow attackers to violate the SFRs.

Vulnerability analysis deals with the threats that an attacker will be able to discover flaws that will allow unauthorised access to data and functionality, allow the ability to interfere with or alter the TSF, or interfere with the authorised capabilities of other users.”

This page is intentionally left blank

D Annexes

List of annexes of this certification report

Annex A: Security Target provided within a separate document.

Annex B: Evaluation results regarding development and production environment 35

This page is intentionally left blank.

Annex B of Certification Report BSI-DSZ-CC-0819-2012

Evaluation results regarding development and production environment

The IT product STARCOS 3.5 ID SAC+EAC+AA C1 (Target of Evaluation, TOE) has been evaluated at an approved evaluation facility using the Common Methodology for IT Security Evaluation (CEM), Version 3.1 extended by advice of the Certification Body for components beyond EAL 4 and guidance specific for the technology of the product for conformance to the Common Criteria for IT Security Evaluation (CC), Version 3.1.

As a result of the TOE certification, dated 24 July 2012, the following results regarding the development and production environment apply. The Common Criteria assurance requirements ALC – Life cycle support (i.e. ALC_CMC.4, ALC_CMS.4, ALC_DEL.1, ALC_DVS.2, ALC_LCD.1, ALC_TAT.1)

are fulfilled for the development and production sites of the TOE listed below:

- Giesecke & Devrient GmbH, Development Centre Germany, Zamdorferstrasse 88, 81677 Munich, Germany, Site Certificate BSI-DSZ-CC-S-0009-2012 (development)
- Smartrac Technology, 142 Moo, Hi-Tech Industrial Estate Tambon Ban Laean, Amphor Bang-Pa-In, 13160 Ayutthaya, Thailand, Site Certificate BSI-DSZ-CC-S-0007-2011 (inlay embedding)
- Smartrac Technology Germany GmbH, Gewerbeparkstr. 10, 51580 Reichshof-Wehnrath, Germany, Site Certificate BSI-DSZ-CC-S-0008-2011 (inlay embedding)
- HID Global Ireland Teoranta, Pairc Tionscail na Tulaigh, Baile na hAbhann, Co. Galway, Ireland, Site Certificate BSI-DSZ-CC-S-0004-2010 (inlay embedding)
- Giesecke & Devrient Slovakia, s.r.o., Dolné Hony 11, 949 01 Nitra, Slovakia, Site Certificate BSI-DSZ-CC-S-0012-2012 (inlay embedding, initialisation and card production)
- Giesecke & Devrient GmbH, G&D Dienstleistungscenter, Prinzregentenstrasse 159, 81677 Munich, Germany, Site Certificate BSI-DSZ-CC-S-0010-2012 (initialisation and card production)

For the sites listed above, the requirements have been specifically applied in accordance with the Security Target [6] and [7]. The evaluators verified, that the threats, security objectives and requirements for the TOE life cycle phases up to delivery (as stated in the Security Target [6] and [7]) are fulfilled by the procedures of these sites.

This page is intentionally left blank.