



COMMON CRITERIA CERTIFICATION REPORT

High Sec Labs Secure SK/DK/SX KVMs v33303-C6C6

6 November 2018

383-4-456

v1.1





FOREWORD

This certification report is an UNCLASSIFIED publication, issued under the authority of the Chief, Communications Security Establishment (CSE). Suggestions for amendments should be forwarded through departmental communications security channels to your Client Services Representative at CSE.

The Information Technology (IT) product identified in this certification report, and its associated certificate, has been evaluated at an approved evaluation facility – established under the Canadian Common Criteria Scheme – using the Common Methodology for Information Technology Security Evaluation, Version 3.1 Revision 4, for conformance to the Common Criteria for Information Technology Security Evaluation, Version 3.1 Revision 4. This certification report, and its associated certificate, applies only to the identified version and release of the product in its evaluated configuration. The evaluation has been conducted in accordance with the provisions of the Canadian CC Scheme, and the conclusions of the evaluation facility in the evaluation report are consistent with the evidence adduced. This report, and its associated certificate, are not an endorsement of the IT product by the Communications Security Establishment, or any other organization that recognizes or gives effect to this report, and its associated certificate, and no warranty for the IT product by the Communications Security Establishment, or any other organization that recognizes or gives effect to this report, and its associated certificate, is either expressed or implied.

If your department has identified a requirement for this certification report based on business needs and would like more detailed information, please contact:

ITS Client Services

Telephone: (613) 991-7654

E-mail: itsclientservices@cse-cst.gc.ca



OVERVIEW

The Canadian Common Criteria Scheme provides a third-party evaluation service for determining the trustworthiness of Information Technology (IT) security products. Evaluations are performed by a commercial Common Criteria Evaluation Facility (CCEF) under the oversight of the Certification Body, which is managed by the Communications Security Establishment.

A CCEF is a commercial facility that has been approved by the Certification Body to perform Common Criteria evaluations; a significant requirement for such approval is accreditation to the requirements of ISO/IEC 17025:2005, the General Requirements for the Competence of Testing and Calibration Laboratories.

By awarding a Common Criteria certificate, the Certification Body asserts that the product complies with the security requirements specified in the associated security target. A security target is a requirements specification document that defines the scope of the evaluation activities. The consumer of certified IT products should review the security target, in addition to this certification report, in order to gain an understanding of any assumptions made during the evaluation, the IT product's intended environment, the evaluated security functionality, and the testing and analysis conducted by the CCEF.

The certification report, certificate of product evaluation and security target are posted to the Certified Products list (CPL) for the Canadian CC Scheme and to the Common Criteria portal (the official website of the International Common Criteria Project).



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	6
1 Identification of Target of Evaluation	7
1.1 Common Criteria Conformance.....	7
1.2 TOE Description	7
1.3 TOE Architecture	8
2 Security Policy	9
3 Assumptions and Clarifications of Scope	10
3.1 Usage and Environmental Assumptions.....	10
3.2 Clarification of Scope.....	10
4 Evaluated Configuration	11
4.1 Documentation.....	11
5 Evaluation Analysis Activities	12
5.1 Development	12
5.2 Guidance Documents	12
5.3 Life-cycle Support	12
6 Testing Activities	13
6.1 Assessment of Developer Tests.....	13
6.2 Conduct of Testing.....	13
6.3 Independent Functional Testing.....	13
6.4 Independent Penetration Testing	14
7 Results of the Evaluation	15
7.1 Recommendations/Comments.....	15
8 Supporting Content	16
8.1 List of Abbreviations.....	16
8.2 References.....	17



LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1 TOE Architecture8

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 TOE Identification7



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

High Sec Labs Secure SK/DK/SX KVMs v33303-C6C6 (hereafter referred to as the Target of Evaluation, or TOE), from High Security Labs Ltd., was the subject of this Common Criteria evaluation. A description of the TOE can be found in Section 1.2. The results of this evaluation demonstrate that TOE meets the requirements of the conformance claim listed in Table 1 for the evaluated security functionality.

EWA-Canada is the CCEF that conducted the evaluation. This evaluation was completed 6 November 2018 and was carried out in accordance with the rules of the Canadian Common Criteria Scheme.

The scope of the evaluation is defined by the security target, which identifies assumptions made during the evaluation, the intended environment for TOE, and the security functional/assurance requirements. Consumers are advised to verify that their operating environment is consistent with that specified in the security target, and to give due consideration to the comments, observations and recommendations in this certification report.

Communications Security Establishment, as the Certification Body, declares that the TOE evaluation meets all the conditions of the Arrangement on the Recognition of Common Criteria Certificates and that the product will be listed on the Canadian Certified Products list (CPL) and the Common Criteria portal (the official website of the International Common Criteria Project).



1 IDENTIFICATION OF TARGET OF EVALUATION

The Target of Evaluation (TOE) is identified as follows:

Table 1 TOE Identification

TOE Name and Version	High Sec Labs Secure SK/DK/SX KVMs v33303-C6C6
Developer	High Security Labs Ltd.
Conformance Claim	Protection Profile for Peripheral Sharing Switch, Version 3.0, 13 February 2015

1.1 COMMON CRITERIA CONFORMANCE

The evaluation was conducted using the Common Methodology for Information Technology Security Evaluation, Version 3.1 Revision 4, for conformance to the Common Criteria for Information Technology Security Evaluation, Version 3.1 Revision 4.

1.2 TOE DESCRIPTION

The TOE allows the secure sharing of a single set of peripheral components such as keyboard, Video Display and Mouse/Pointing devices among multiple computers through standard USB, HDMI, and DisplayPort interfaces.

The TOE uses multiple isolated microcontrollers (one microcontroller per connected computer) to emulate the connected peripherals in order to prevent various methods of attacks such as: display signaling, keyboard signaling, power signaling etc. It is also equipped with multiple unidirectional flow forcing devices to assure adherence to the organizational confidentiality policy through strict isolation of connected computers.

1.3 TOE ARCHITECTURE

A diagram of the TOE architecture is as follows:




Figure 1 TOE Architecture



2 SECURITY POLICY

The TOE implements policies pertaining to the following security functional classes:

- User Data Protection
- Protection of the TSF
- TOE Access
- Security Audit
- Identification and authentication
- Security Management

Complete details of the security functional requirements (SFRs) can be found in the Security Target (ST) referenced in section 8.2.



3 ASSUMPTIONS AND CLARIFICATIONS OF SCOPE

Consumers of the TOE should consider assumptions about usage and environmental settings as requirements for the product's installation and its operating environment. This will ensure the proper and secure operation of the TOE.

3.1 USAGE AND ENVIRONMENTAL ASSUMPTIONS

The following assumptions are made regarding the use and deployment of the TOE:

- Computers and peripheral devices connected to the TOE are not TEMPEST approved;
- Computers connected to the TOE are not equipped with special analog data collection cards or peripherals such as: Analog to digital interface, high performance audio interface, Digital Signal Processing function, and analog video capture function;
- Physical security, commensurate with the value of the TOE and the data it contains, is provided by the environment;
- TOE Administrators and users are trusted to follow and apply all guidance in a trusted manner; and
- Personnel configuring the TOE and its operational environment will follow the applicable security configuration guidance.

3.2 CLARIFICATION OF SCOPE

The following functions/features are specifically excluded from the scope of the evaluation;

- TOE cable connected remote control unit or control computer that provides user monitoring and control of the TOE from remote locations – device called Remote Desktop Controllers (RDC)



4 EVALUATED CONFIGURATION

The evaluated configuration for the TOE comprises the following models:

Model	Part Number	Description	Firmware version
SK21PP-3	CGA15445	Secure SH KVM Switch 2-Port DP to DP video 4K, PP 3.0	33303-C6C6
DK22PP-3	CGA15447	Secure DH KVM Switch 2-Port DP to DP video 4K, PP 3.0	33303-C6C6
DK22PPD-3	CGA15882	Secure DH KVM Switch 2-Port DVI-I to DVI-I and DP to DP, PP 3.0	33303-C6C6
SK21PH-3	CGA15437	Secure SH KVM Switch 2-Port DP/HDMI to DP/HDMI video 4K, PP 3.0	33303-C6C6
DK22PH-3	CGA15438	Secure DH KVM Switch 2-Port DP/HDMI to DP/HDMI video 4K, PP 3.0	33303-C6C6
SX22PP-3	CGA15777	Secure SH Mini-Matrix KVM Switch 2-Port DP to DP video 4K, PP 3.0	33303-C6C6
SX22PH-3	CGA15778	Secure SH Mini-Matrix KVM Switch 2-Port DP/HDMI to DP/HDMI video 4K, PP 3.0	33303-C6C6
SK41PP-3	CGA15485	Secure SH KVM Switch 4-Port DisplayPort to DisplayPort 4K video, PP 3.0	33303-C6C6
SK41PH-3	CGA15780	Secure SH KVM Switch 4-Port DP/HDMI to DP/HDMI 4K video, PP 3.0	33303-C6C6
DK42PP-3	CGA15486	Secure DH KVM Switch 4-Port DisplayPort to DisplayPort 4K video, PP 3.0	33303-C6C6

4.1 DOCUMENTATION

The following documents are provided to the consumer to assist in the configuration and installation of the TOE:

- a. HighSecLabs Quick Installation Guide 2/4/8 Ports High Security Single-Head DP-DP KVM Switches, HD15898, Rev 1.2, May 2018
- b. HighSecLabs Quick Installation Guide 2/4/8 Ports High Security Dual-Head DP-DP KVM Switches, HD15899, Rev 1.2, May 2018
- c. HighSecLabs Quick Installation Guide 2/4/8 Ports High Security DP-DP Mini-Matrix KVM Switches, HD15915, Rev 1.3, May 2018
- d. HSL Administrator Guide, Doc No.: HDC10956, Rev D, May 2018



5 EVALUATION ANALYSIS ACTIVITIES

The evaluation analysis activities involved a structured evaluation of the TOE. Documentation and process dealing with Development, Guidance Documents, and Life-Cycle Support were evaluated.

5.1 DEVELOPMENT

The evaluators analyzed the documentation provided by the vendor; they determined that the design completely and accurately describes the TOE security functionality (TSF) interfaces and how the TSF implements the security functional requirements (SFRs). The evaluators determined that the initialization process is secure, that the security functions are protected against tamper and bypass, and that security domains are maintained.

5.2 GUIDANCE DOCUMENTS

The evaluators examined the TOE preparative user guidance and operational user guidance and determined that it sufficiently and unambiguously describes how to securely transform the TOE into its evaluated configuration and how to use and administer the product. The evaluators examined and tested the preparative and operational guidance, and determined that they are complete and sufficiently detailed to result in a secure configuration.

Section 4.1 provides details on the guidance documents.

5.3 LIFE-CYCLE SUPPORT

An analysis of the TOE configuration management system and associated documentation was performed. The evaluators found that the TOE configuration items were clearly marked.

The evaluators examined the delivery documentation and determined that it described all of the procedures required to maintain the integrity of the TOE during distribution to the consumer.



6 TESTING ACTIVITIES

Testing consists of the following three steps: assessing developer tests, performing independent functional tests, and performing penetration tests.

6.1 ASSESSMENT OF DEVELOPER TESTS

The evaluators verified that the developer has met their testing responsibilities by examining their test evidence, and reviewing their test results, as documented in the ETR. The correspondence between the tests identified in the developer's test documentation and the functional specification was complete.

6.2 CONDUCT OF TESTING

The TOE was subjected to a comprehensive suite of formally documented, independent functional and penetration tests. The detailed testing activities, including configurations, procedures, test cases, expected results and observed results are documented in a separate Test Results document.

6.3 INDEPENDENT FUNCTIONAL TESTING

During this evaluation, the evaluator developed independent functional tests by examining design and guidance documentation.

All testing was planned and documented to a sufficient level of detail to allow repeatability of the testing procedures and results. The following testing activities were performed:

- a. PP Assurance Activities: The evaluator performed the assurance activities listed in the claimed PP.

6.3.1 FUNCTIONAL TEST RESULTS

The developer's tests and the independent functional tests yielded the expected results, providing assurance that the TOE behaves as specified in its ST and functional specification.



6.4 INDEPENDENT PENETRATION TESTING

Subsequent to the independent review of public domain vulnerability databases and all evaluation deliverables, limited independent evaluator penetration testing was conducted. The penetration tests focused on:

- a. Use of automated vulnerability scanning tools to discover potential network, platform and application layer vulnerabilities such as Heartbleed, Shellshock, FREAK, POODLE, and GHOST.

6.4.1 PENETRATION TEST RESULTS

The independent penetration testing did not uncover any exploitable vulnerabilities in the intended operating environment.



7 RESULTS OF THE EVALUATION

This evaluation has provided the basis for the conformance claim documented in Table 1. The overall verdict for this evaluation is **PASS**. These results are supported by evidence in the ETR.

The IT product identified in this report has been evaluated at an approved evaluation facility established under the Canadian Common Criteria Scheme using the Common Methodology for IT Security Evaluation, Version 3.1 Revision 4, for conformance to the Common Criteria for IT Security Evaluation, Version 3.1 Revision 4. These evaluation results apply 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 Canadian Common Criteria Scheme and the conclusions of the evaluation facility in the evaluation report are consistent with the evidence adduced. This is not an endorsement of the IT product by CSE or by any other organization that recognizes or gives effect to this certificate, and no warranty of the IT product by CSE or by any other organization that recognizes or gives effect to this certificate, is expressed or implied.

7.1 RECOMMENDATIONS/COMMENTS

It is recommended that all guidance outlined in Section 4.1 be followed to configure the TOE in the evaluated configuration.



8 SUPPORTING CONTENT

8.1 LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Term	Definition
CAVP	Cryptographic Algorithm Validation Program
CCEF	Common Criteria Evaluation Facility
CM	Configuration Management
CMVP	Cryptographic Module Validation Program
CSE	Communications Security Establishment
EAL	Evaluation Assurance Level
ETR	Evaluation Technical Report
GC	Government of Canada
IT	Information Technology
ITS	Information Technology Security
PP	Protection Profile
SFR	Security Functional Requirement
ST	Security Target
TOE	Target of Evaluation
TSF	TOE Security Function



8.2 REFERENCES

Reference
Common Criteria for Information Technology Security Evaluation, Version 3.1 Revision 4, September 2012.
Common Methodology for Information Technology Security Evaluation, CEM, Version 3.1 Revision 4, April 2017.
Security Target for High Security Labs Secure 2 and 4 Ports DP-DP KVM and Matrix, 6 November 2018, Revision C
Evaluation Technical Report for HSL Secure 2 and 4 Ports DP-DP and Matrix KVMs, 6 November 2018, v1.2
Assurance Activity Report for HSL Secure 2 and Ports DP-DP and Matrix KVMs, 5 November 2018, v1.2