



Certification Report

Kazumasa Fujie, Chairman
Information-technology Promotion Agency, Japan

Target of Evaluation (TOE)

Application Date/ID	2011-10-27 (ITC-1383)
Certification No.	C0371
Sponsor	Microsoft Corporation
TOE Name	Microsoft SQL Server 2012 Database Engine Enterprise Edition x64 (English)
TOE Version	11.0.2100.60
PP Conformance	None
Assurance Package	EAL2
Developer	Microsoft Corporation
Evaluation Facility	TÜV Informationstechnik GmbH, Evaluation Body for IT-Security

This is to report that the evaluation result for the above TOE is certified as follows.
2012-09-06

Takumi Yamasato, Technical Manager
Information Security Certification Office
IT Security Center
Technology Headquarters

Evaluation Criteria, etc.: This TOE is evaluated in accordance with the following standards prescribed in the "IT Security Evaluation and Certification Scheme".

- Common Criteria for Information Technology Security Evaluation
Version 3.1 Release 3
- Common Methodology for Information Technology Security Evaluation
Version 3.1 Release 3

Evaluation Result: Pass

"Microsoft SQL Server 2012 Database Engine Enterprise Edition x64 (English)" has been evaluated based on the standards required, in accordance with the provisions of the "IT Security Certification Procedure" by Information-technology Promotion Agency, Japan, and has met the specified assurance requirements.

Notice:

This document is the English translation version of the Certification Report published by the Certification Body of Japan Information Technology Security Evaluation and Certification Scheme.

Table of Contents

1	Executive Summary	1
1.1	Product Overview	1
1.1.1	Assurance Package	1
1.1.2	TOE and Security Functionality	1
1.1.2.1	Threats and Security Objectives.....	1
1.1.2.2	Configuration and Assumptions	2
1.1.3	Disclaimers	2
1.2	Conduct of Evaluation.....	2
1.3	Certification	2
2	Identification.....	3
3	Security Policy	4
3.1	Security Function Policies	4
3.1.1	Threats and Security Function Policies	4
3.1.1.1	Threats	4
3.1.1.2	Security Function Policies against Threats.....	5
3.1.2	Organizational Security Policies and Security Function Policies	7
3.1.2.1	Organizational Security Policies	7
3.1.2.2	Security Function Policies to Organizational Security Policies	7
4	Assumptions and Clarification of Scope	9
4.1	Usage Assumptions	9
4.2	Environmental Assumptions	9
4.3	Clarification of Scope	10
5	Architectural Information.....	11
5.1	TOE Boundary and Components	11
5.2	IT Environment.....	12
6	Documentation.....	13
7	Evaluation conducted by Evaluation Facility and Results	14
7.1	Evaluation Approach.....	14
7.2	Overview of Evaluation Activity.....	14
7.3	IT Product Testing.....	15
7.3.1	Developer Testing.....	15
7.3.2	Evaluator Independent Testing	16
7.3.3	Evaluator Penetration Testing.....	18
7.4	Evaluated Configuration	20
7.5	Evaluation Results	21
7.6	Evaluator Comments/Recommendations	21

8	Certification	22
8.1	Certification Result	22
8.2	Recommendations	22
9	Annexes	23
10	Security Target	23
11	Glossary.....	24
12	Bibliography.....	25

1 Executive Summary

This Certification Report describes the content of the certification result in relation to IT Security Evaluation of "Microsoft SQL Server 2012 Database Engine Enterprise Edition x64 (English)" (hereinafter referred to as the "TOE") developed by Microsoft Corporation, and the evaluation of the TOE was finished on 2012-08 by TÜV Informationstechnik GmbH, Evaluation Body for IT-Security (hereinafter referred to as the "Evaluation Facility"). It is intended to report to the sponsor, Microsoft Corporation, and provide security information to procurement personnel and consumers who are interested in this TOE.

Readers of the Certification Report are advised to read the Security Target (hereinafter referred to as the "ST") that is the appendix of this report together. Especially, details of security functional requirements, assurance requirements and rationale for sufficiency of these requirements of the TOE are described in the ST.

This Certification Report assumes "procurement personnel and general consumers who purchase this TOE that is commercially available" to be readers. Note that the Certification Report presents the certification result based on assurance requirements to which the TOE conforms, and does not guarantee an individual IT product itself.

1.1 Product Overview

An overview of the TOE functions and operational conditions is provided as follows. Refer to Chapter 2 and subsequent chapters for details.

1.1.1 Assurance Package

Assurance Package of the TOE is EAL2.

1.1.2 TOE and Security Functionality

This TOE is the core area of the software components that build Microsoft's database management system (Microsoft SQL Server 2012). Microsoft SQL Server 2012 consists of a database engine (this TOE) with various support tools (user database management UI tools, various data analysis tools, client development aid tools, and so on) added.

This TOE provides a series of security functionality to prevent unauthorized access to critical configuration data that affects internally managed databases and/or security.

Regarding these security functionalities, the validity of the design policy and the accuracy of the implementation were evaluated in the scope of the assurance package. The TOE assumes threats and assumptions as described in the following sections.

1.1.2.1 Threats and Security Objectives

The TOE counters each threat with the following security functionalities.

There are various threats of disclosure and falsification through unauthorized access to protected assets, including databases that the TOE handles and setting information related to security functionality.

In order to counteract such threats, this TOE provides access control by authenticating each user to allow users to perform only their permitted operations. In addition, by generating and managing audit data related to security events, the TOE detects unauthorized operations.

1.1.2.2 Configuration and Assumptions

The evaluated product is assumed to be operated under the following configuration and assumptions.

This TOE shall be installed with required software (such as OS) to operate the TOE to a dedicated server machine, and used in an environment that allows communication with other connected client machines via a network.

The server machine to which this TOE is installed shall be placed to a location physically protected from unauthorized access, and it shall be operated in a network environment where communication data between the server and the clients is protected from falsification and eavesdropping.

1.1.3 Disclaimers

This TOE is included in Microsoft SQL Server 2012 Enterprise Edition, which is offered with three configurations available based on the CPU architecture (x84, x64, and IA 64). This certification is subject to x64 version only. For the CPUs supported by this TOE, see Section 4.2 "Environmental Assumptions."

1.2 Conduct of Evaluation

Under the IT Security Evaluation and Certification Scheme that the Certification Body operates, the Evaluation Facility conducted IT security evaluation and completed on 2012-08, based on functional requirements and assurance requirements of the TOE according to the publicized documents "IT Security Evaluation and Certification Scheme" [1], "Requirements for IT Security Certification" [2], and "Requirements for Approval of Evaluation Facility" [3] provided by the Certification Body.

1.3 Certification

The Certification Body verified the Evaluation Technical Report [13] and the Observation Reports prepared by the Evaluation Facility as well as evaluation evidential materials, and confirmed that the TOE evaluation was conducted in accordance with the prescribed procedure. The certification oversight reviews are also prepared for those concerns found in the certification process. Those concerns pointed out by the Certification Body were fully resolved, and the Certification Body confirmed that the TOE evaluation had been appropriately conducted in accordance with the CC ([4][5][6] or [7][8][9]) and the CEM (either of [10][11]). The Certification Body prepared this Certification Report based on the Evaluation Technical Report submitted by the Evaluation Facility and fully concluded certification activities.

2 Identification

The TOE is identified as follows:

TOE Name:	Microsoft SQL Server 2012 Database Engine Enterprise Edition x64 (English)
TOE Version:	11.0.2100.60
Developer:	Microsoft Corporation

Users can verify that a product is the evaluated and certified TOE by the following means.

Users can identify the installed product as this evaluated TOE by following the procedure found in the product document to send an SQL command to obtain the TOE version of the running TOE and comparing it to the applicable description of that in the TOE configuration list.

3 Security Policy

This chapter describes security function policies employed by this TOE to counteract threats and organizational security policies.

The TOE provides security functionality to defend against unauthorized access to its internally managed database.

In order to comply with organizational security policies, the TOE has a functionality to generate audit data related to security events and properly manage the generated audit data.

It also prevents the security functionality from being disabled or abused by allowing only system administrators to configure the various security settings described above.

The assets protected by this TOE's security functionality are:

(1) Protected assets (user data)

- User information stored and managed in a database
- Query information, such as stored procedures, created by users and managed within the TOE

(2) Protected assets (major TSF data)

- Database definition information containing various information, including roles and user account mapping information.
- User account information and other information related to role definition
- Various setting information related to security functionality
- Security audit data

3.1 Security Function Policies

The TOE possesses the security functionality to counter the threats listed in Section 3.1.1., and to satisfy the organizational security policies listed in Section 3.1.2.

3.1.1 Threats and Security Function Policies

3.1.1.1 Threats

The TOE assumes the threats shown in Table 3-1 and provides the security functionalities to counter them.

Table 3-1: Assumed Threats

Identifier	Threat
T.MASQUERADE	A user or process may masquerade as another entity in order to gain unauthorized access to data or TOE resources.
T.UNAUTHORIZED_ACCESS	A user may gain unauthorized access to user data for which they are not authorized according to the TOE security policy.
T.TSF_COMPROMISE	A malicious user or process may cause configuration data to be inappropriately accessed (viewed, modified, or deleted).
T.UNIDENTIFIED_ACTIONS	Failure of the authorized administrator to identify and act upon unauthorized actions may occur. *The authorized administrator corresponds to the system administrator in this TOE.

3.1.1.2 Security Function Policies against Threats

The TOE counters the threats listed in Table 3-1 by the following security function policies.

1) Countermeasures against threat “T.MASQUERADE”

This threat refers to a possibility of unauthorized access to the database from an attacker spoofing an authentic user of the TOE.

This TOE defends against this threat with the user ID authentication functionality below:

- ID authentication functionality

It is a functionality which verifies that the user attempting to use the TOE is an authorized user, and which allows only authorized users to access the TOE. There are two mechanisms to achieve this functionality: Windows authentication and SQL Server authentication. The system administrator chooses either method for each account when creating user accounts.

(Windows authentication)

User account information (account security identifier, or SID) authenticated by the OS using the ID authentication functionality in the Windows OS (the host of the TOE) is obtained and mapped to the user account of the TOE.

(SQL Server authentication)

The TOE itself verifies the authenticity of a user by comparing the login name and password against user account information managed by the TOE.

Authenticated users are allowed to use the TOE based on the user role assigned to each of their accounts.

2) Countermeasures against threat “T.UNAUTHORIZED_ACCESS”

This threat refers to a possibility of unauthorized access to the database from users without appropriate rights.

This TOE manages the access control list that defines permission or denial for each database operation. By using this access control list and user account information identified in the above ID authentication functionality, the TOE defends against unauthorized access to the database by enforcing access control with the timing required for the operation from users. The following explains the access control functionality.

- Access control functionality

This functionality manages the following right list for each database stored in the TOE.

- List of explicit permission or denial for certain accounts regarding each database operation (creation, modification, reference, deletion, and so on)
- List of explicit permission or denial for certain roles regarding each database operation (each role and account information belonging to each role are managed per database and related objects)

User information and these right lists are referenced every time when a database operation request (SQL) is sent to the TOE from a user via a client, and access control is enforced based on the following rules:

1. If an explicit denial on a specific operation from the user account is defined, the operation requested from that user is denied.
2. If an explicit denial on a specific operation from any role to which a user account belongs is defined, the operation requested from that user is denied.
3. If an explicit permission on a specific operation from the user account is defined, the operation requested from that user is permitted.
4. If an explicit permission on a specific operation from any role to which a user account belongs is defined, the operation requested from that user is permitted.
5. If none of the above rules apply, the operation is denied.

However, the system administrators and other users who created the databases (database owners) are permitted for all operations to the databases. For this functionality, the default roles provided in advance by the TOE (for example, db_datareader role with permission to reference all table information of the databases and db_datawriter role with permission to add, delete, and modify all table information of the databases) or other roles newly defined by the system administrators and database owners are used.

3) Countermeasures against threat “T.TSF_COMPROMISE”

This threat refers to a possibility of unauthorized access to setting information and/or attribute values related to security.

To defend against this threat, this TOE enforces access control based on the user rights to operations related to user accounts (creation, deletion, changing rights, and so on), operations related to database access rights, and other operations including security configuration changes. The TOE prevents unauthorized access by limiting these operations to users with system administrator rights only.

4) Countermeasures against threat “T.UNIDENTIFIED_ACTIONS”

This threat refers to a possibility that an appropriate response is not available because the TOE operators fail to detect an event of unauthorized operation. In order to defend against this threat, this TOE provides the following security audit functionality:

- Security audit functionality

When a security event subject to audit occurs, the TOE generates an audit log including items such as event type, user ID, date and time of the event, the result of the event, and stores this audit log as an audit log file. It also provides an interface to a system administrator to read the audit log files generated. Generated audit log files are protected by the access control functionality provided by the OS.

In addition, date/time information is obtained from the OS system clock in order to record the event date/time in the audit log.

3.1.2 Organizational Security Policies and Security Function Policies

3.1.2.1 Organizational Security Policies

Organizational security policies required in use of the TOE are shown in Table 3-2.

Table 3-2 Organizational Security Policies

Identifier	Organizational Security Policy
P.ACCOUNTABILITY	The authorized users of the TOE shall be held accountable for their actions within the TOE.
P.ROLES	The TOE shall provide an authorized administrator role for secure administration of the TOE. This role shall be separate and distinct from other authorized users.

3.1.2.2 Security Function Policies to Organizational Security Policies

The TOE provides the security functionalities to meet the organizational security policies shown in Table 3-2.

1) Means for organizational security policy “P.ACCOUNTABILITY”

This security policy requires accountability for the TOE users’ operations. In order to comply with this policy, the TOE achieves accountability of the users’ actions by providing the security audit functionality described above, generating the audit log containing all events related to the security functionality, and managing the audit log files.

2) Means for organizational security policy “P.ROLES”

This security policy requires that roles be defined independently from those of general users in order to securely manage the TOE.

This TOE complies with this security policy by defining the system administrator role with administrator right related to the security functionality and managing this role separately from those of general users.

4 Assumptions and Clarification of Scope

This chapter describes the assumptions and the operational environment to operate the TOE as useful information for the assumed readers to determine the use of the TOE.

4.1 Usage Assumptions

Table 4-1 shows assumptions to operate the TOE. The effective performances of the TOE security functionalities are not assured unless these assumptions are satisfied.

Table 4-1: Assumptions in Use of the TOE

Identifier	Assumptions
A.NO_EVIL	Administrators are non-hostile, appropriately trained, and follow all administrator guidance. *Administrators correspond to the system administrators in this TOE.
A.NO_GENERAL_PURPOSE	There are no general-purpose computing or storage repository capabilities (e.g., compilers or user applications) available on DBMS servers, other than those services necessary for the operation, administration and support of the DBMS.
A.PHYSICAL	It is assumed that appropriate physical security is provided within the domain for the value of the IT assets protected by the TOE and the value of the stored, processed, and transmitted information.

4.2 Environmental Assumptions

This TOE shall be installed with an OS to a server machine placed at a physically secure location, and used by the connected clients via a network.

Communication with the clients shall use the command communication tools provided by the TOE developer, development aid tools contained in the product along with the TOE, and independently developed client applications.

Hardware that comprises the server machine, related software such as the OS, and the reliability of both are beyond the scope of this evaluation (and are assumed sufficiently reliable).

Table 4-2 shows the hardware specification required for the target server machine to which the TOE is installed, and Table 4-3 illustrates required software other than the TOE.

Table 4-2: Hardware Requirements

CPU	1.4 GHz or faster AMD Opteron, AMD Athlon 64, Intel Xeon with Intel EM64T support, Intel Pentium IV with EM64T support
RAM	1GB
Hard Disk	At least 1500 MB of free space
Other	DVD ROM drive, display at S-VGA, pointing device, keyboard

Table 4-3: Software Requirements

OS	Windows Server 2008 R2 Enterprise Edition (x64), English version
Other software	.NET Framework 3.5 SP1/4

4.3 Clarification of Scope

As shown in Section 4.2, this TOE is a software product installed to a server machine.

The network consisting of the TOE and clients shall be a secure environment where communication data is protected from unauthorized access including eavesdropping, and the TOE operator shall be responsible to build such an operational environment.

5 Architectural Information

This chapter explains the scope and main components (subsystems) of the TOE.

5.1 TOE Boundary and Components

This TOE works as one application on the operating system (OS). Figure 5-1 illustrates the internal structure of the TOE. The shaded area represents the TOE; it excludes the local SQL client, remote SQL client, other parts of SQL Server Platform, and resources of the OS.




Figure 5-1: TOE Boundary

The following outlines each component.

[Communication/Command Interpreter]

The component that is responsible for communication processes with the outside of the TOE. All of SQL reception processes from external components such as clients and response processes to the outside are done through this component.

[Relational Engine]

The main component for database operation processes and security-related processes. This component interprets SQL statements received through Communication/Command Interpreter, performs the access right check, runs as an internal process to the database, and sends necessary responses.

[Storage Engine]

The component that manages the physical storage information, including the memory to store the databases and their related objects as well the HDDs. Necessary storage addresses and other information are passed based on demands from the Relational Engine.

[SQL-OS]

The component that manages various internal resources required for the TOE to run. This component is composed of two parts: Task Management that schedules the threads and Memory Management that manages memory resources used internally.

5.2 IT Environment

This TOE works on the hardware and operating system, processing SQL statements sent from clients via a network.

Part of the security functionality provided by the TOE is achieved by combining with the TOE itself and other functionality that is provided by the OS. The following are functionalities achieved by the functionality provided in the IT environment, or the OS:

- ID authentication functionality provided by Windows authentication
- Protection of the generated log data
- Date/time information to be used in the audit log

6 Documentation

The identification of documents attached to the TOE is listed below. TOE users are required to fully understand and comply with the following documents in order to satisfy the assumptions.

Microsoft SQL Server 2012 Database Engine Common Criteria Evaluation
Guidance addendum, Version 1.2 (2012-08-13)

Microsoft SQL Server 2012 Database Engine Common Criteria Evaluation, SQL
Server Books Online (June 2012)
(File name: SQLServer2012Documentation_June.exe)

These documents are provided by downloading from the Website below. TOE users are required to refer to the following Website when purchasing the TOE.

<https://www.microsoft.com/sqlserver/en/us/common-criteria.aspx>

7 Evaluation conducted by Evaluation Facility and Results

7.1 Evaluation Approach

Evaluation was conducted by using the evaluation methods prescribed in the CEM in accordance with the assurance components in the CC Part 3. Details for evaluation activities were reported in the Evaluation Technical Report. The Evaluation Technical Report explains the summary of the TOE as well as the content of the evaluation and the verdict of each work unit in the CEM.

7.2 Overview of Evaluation Activity

The history of the evaluation conducted is described in the Evaluation Technical Report as follows.

The evaluation has started on 2011-10 and concluded upon completion of the Evaluation Technical Report dated 2012-08. The Evaluation Facility received a full set of evaluation deliverables necessary for evaluation provided by the developer, and examined the evidence in relation to a series of evaluation conducted. Additionally, the evaluators directly visited the development and manufacturing sites on 2012-03 and examined procedural status conducted in relation to each work unit for configuration management, delivery, and development security, by investigating records and interviewing staff. Further, the evaluators conducted checks of the developer testing and the evaluator testing by using the developer testing environment at the developer site on 2012-06 and 2012-07.

Concerns found in the evaluation activities for each work unit were all issued as the Observation Reports, and those were reported to the developer. Those concerns were reviewed by the developer, and all the concerns were solved eventually.

Concerns that the Certification Body found in the evaluation process were described as the certification oversight reviews, and those were sent to the Evaluation Facility.

After the Evaluation Facility and the developer examined them, those concerns were reflected in the Evaluation Technical Report.

7.3 IT Product Testing

The evaluators confirmed the validity of the testing that the developer had conducted. As a result of the evidence obtained through the evaluation process and those confirmed validity, the evaluators conducted the reproducibility testing, additional testing and penetration testing based on vulnerability assessments judged to be necessary.

7.3.1 Developer Testing

The evaluators evaluated the integrity of the developer testing conducted by the developer and the documentation of actual testing results. The content of the developer testing evaluated by the evaluators is described as follows.

1) Developer Testing Environment

Figure 7-1 shows the testing configuration conducted by the developer.




Figure 7-1: Configuration of the Developer Testing

The developer testing was conducted in the same TOE testing environment as the TOE configuration identified by this ST. Testing tools and other components to send SQL statements are installed to the client machine.

2) Overview of the Developer Testing

This section outlines the overview of the developer testing.

a) Developer Testing Outline

The outline of the developer testing is shown below.

<Developer Testing Approach>

In the developer testing, SQL statements were sent to the clients' communication interface (the TOE's external interface), and the contents of the database reflected by the SQL operations as well as the response messages from the TOE (such as error messages) were observed.

In the actual testing, a combination of scripts (test scenarios) and a testing tool, developed by the developer to send a series of scripted SQL statements to the TOE and simultaneously automatically determine the result according to a verification method for the process result written out as a script, was used.

The validity of this testing tool and these test scenarios, including the design specification and integrity with applicable documents, was confirmed by the evaluators.

<Developer Testing Details>

In the developer testing, various scripts (test scenarios) were run using the testing tool above, and the contents of the test results determined (and output as test logs) by the tool based on the verification method written in the scripts were evaluated.

In some tests related to access control functionality, multiple clients were connected and verified in a multi-session environment.

b) Scope of the Developer Testing Conducted

The developer testing was conducted by the developer for 99 scenarios. By the coverage analysis, it was verified that all security functionalities and external interfaces described in the functional specification had been tested.

c) Result

The evaluators confirmed an approach of the developer testing conducted and the legitimacy of tested items, and confirmed consistencies between the testing approach described in the testing plan and the actual testing approach. The evaluators confirmed consistencies between the testing results expected by the developer and the actual testing results conducted by the developer.

7.3.2 Evaluator Independent Testing

The evaluators conducted a series of sample testing to reconfirm the execution of security functionalities by the test items extracted from the developer testing. In addition, the evaluators conducted the evaluator independent testing (hereinafter referred to as the "independent testing") to ensure that security functionalities are certainly implemented from the evidence obtained through the process of the evaluation. The independent testing conducted by the evaluators is explained as follows.

1) Independent Testing Environment

The configuration of the independent testing conducted by the evaluators was the same as that of the developer testing shown in Figure 7-1.

2) Overview of the Independent Testing

This section outlines the overview of the independent testing conducted by the evaluators.

a) Viewpoints of the Independent Testing

Viewpoints of the independent testing that the evaluators designed from the developer testing and the provided evaluation evidential materials are listed below.

<Viewpoints of the Independent Testing>

- (1) To increase a variety of combinations of multiple operations related to security (account creation, right manipulation, database operation) and perform them as a series of processes.
- (2) To use tools different from the developer testing tools to test the SQL transmission process to the TOE and the response reception process.
- (3) To verify that the same results are obtained when the evaluators conduct all scenarios of the developer testing in order to confirm the validation of the developer testing.

b) Independent Testing Outline

This section explains the outline of the independent testing conducted by the evaluators.

<Independent Testing Approach / Method>

In the independent testing, a similar method as the developer testing was employed: a series of SQL statements were sent to the client communication interface, and the contents of the database with the SQL operations reflected as well as the response message from the TOE (such as error messages) were observed. To improve reliability by increasing variety in the testing environment, a test method other than the developer testing tool was employed.

<Independent Testing Tool>

SqlCmd, a command-line tool shipped with the TOE to perform various operations, including SQL transmission, was used in the independent testing, and the evaluators developed scripts to process a series of SQL processes.

<Independent Testing Details >

The independent testing was conducted by the evaluators for seven scenarios. In the sampling test, all 99 of the developer testing scenarios were conducted. In addition, the evaluators conducted additional related tests (nine scenarios) to confirm that the TOE delivery and installation process and other processes can be performed as described in the applicable guidance.

Table 7-1 shows the viewpoints of the major independent testing conducted and their corresponding testing.

Table 7-1: Details of the Independent Testing Conducted

Viewpoint	Outline of the Independent Testing
1), 2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To verify that the access control is enforced in accordance with the defined right by performing a series of SQL statements to create new user accounts, set up the various default roles, define/set up new roles, create databases, and operate databases. Also, to verify that a series of audit logs are correctly generated. • By conducting normal and abnormal tests for ID authentication functionality with two kinds of authentication methods provided by the TOE using different communication tools and different account settings, to verify that consistent results are obtained with the developer testing. • By increasing the variation of operations with the audit log capacity up to the limit, to verify that the same behavior listed in the specification is observed when resources are insufficient.

c) Result

All the independent testing conducted by the evaluators was correctly completed, and the evaluators confirmed the behavior of the TOE. The evaluators confirmed consistencies between the expected behaviors and all the testing results.

7.3.3 Evaluator Penetration Testing

The evaluators devised and conducted the necessary evaluator penetration testing (hereinafter referred to as the "penetration testing") on the potentially exploitable vulnerabilities of concern under the assumed environment of use and attack level from the evidence shown in the process of the evaluation. The penetration testing conducted by the evaluators is explained as follows.

1) Overview of the Penetration Testing

An overview of the penetration testing conducted by the evaluators is as follows.

a) Vulnerability of Concern

The evaluators searched into the provided evidence and the publicly available information for the potential vulnerabilities, and then identified the following vulnerabilities which require the penetration testing.

- 1) A brute-force attack may bypass the ID authentication functionality.
- 2) Client requests with unauthorized formats and/or parameters may bypass the TOE security functionality.
- 3) Unauthorized operations may bypass the security functionality due to existing vulnerabilities in the previous versions of the product that remain in this TOE.
- 4) Illegally formatted data and special character codes used in ID authentication information may bypass the security functionality.
- 5) Unauthorized access to the TOE may be possible from an unexpected network port interface.

b) Penetration Testing Outline

The evaluators conducted the following penetration testing to identify potentially exploitable vulnerabilities.

<Penetration Testing Environment>

The penetration testing was conducted in the same environment as the developer testing and evaluator independent testing shown in Figure 7-1.

Table 7-2 shows the tools used in the penetration testing.

Table 7-2: Configuration of the Penetration Testing

Name (Version)	Outline
Metasploit (4.3.0)	Attack tool using vulnerability scanner and attack codes
ProcessExplorer (15.21)	Tool to collect process detail information provided by Microsoft
SqlCmd (10.50.1600.1)	Command-line tool provided (along with SQL Server) by Microsoft
TCPView (3.05)	Investigation tool for network port and communication session provided by Microsoft

<Test items of the Penetration Testing Conducted>

Table 7-3 shows vulnerabilities of concern and the overview of the penetration testing corresponding to them. The evaluators conducted nine penetration testing to determine the possibility of potentially exploitable vulnerabilities.

Table 7-3: Details of the Penetration Testing Conducted

Vulnerability	Penetration Testing Outline
1)	To verify that the accounts with policy-based passwords have logically sufficient strength based on the measured duration and communication bandwidth when brute-force attacks are launched at these accounts, and that applicable policy is enforced to newly create accounts.
2)	To verify that the TOE remains secure when a fuzzing test is performed against the execution format of the stored procedures managed by the TOE and usage parameters. To verify that the TOE's processes are protected by memory execution prohibition functionality that coordinates with the hardware and the OS, and that unauthorized operations to remove protection are prohibited.
3)	To verify that no known vulnerability remains in this TOE by using Metasploit and related attack codes.
4)	To verify that the TOE remains secure even when illegally formatted data and/or special character codes are used, by performing a fuzzing test for ID authentication information.
5)	To verify that unnecessary network ports are open by use of the port scan tools and vulnerability scan tools. Also, to verify that unexpected network port control does not occur due to possible factors, including the TOE's start-up timing, by comparing the results obtained from multiple tools.

c) Result

In the penetration testing conducted by the evaluators, the evaluators did not find any exploitable vulnerabilities that attackers who have the assumed attack potential could exploit.

7.4 Evaluated Configuration

In this evaluation, the configuration outlined in Figure 7-1 was evaluated. The TOE will not be used in the configuration which is significantly different from the above configuration components. Therefore, the evaluators determined the above evaluated configuration is appropriate.

7.5 Evaluation Results

The evaluators had concluded that the TOE satisfies all work units prescribed in the CEM by submitting the Evaluation Technical Report.

In the evaluation, the following were confirmed.

- PP Conformance: None
- Security functional requirements: Common Criteria Part 2 Extended
- Security assurance requirements: Common Criteria Part 3 Conformant

As a result of the evaluation, the verdict "PASS" was confirmed for the following assurance components.

- All assurance components of EAL2 package

The result of the evaluation is only applied to those which are composed by the TOE corresponding to the identification described in Chapter 2.

7.6 Evaluator Comments/Recommendations

The evaluator recommendations for users are not mentioned.

8 Certification

The Certification Body conducted the following certification based on the materials submitted by the Evaluation Facility through its evaluation process.

1. Contents pointed out in the Observation Reports shall be adequate.
2. Contents pointed out in the Observation Reports shall properly be reflected.
3. The submitted evidential materials were sampled and examined, which shows the related work units shall be evaluated as presented in the Evaluation Technical Report.
4. The rationale of the evaluation verdict by the evaluators presented in the Evaluation Technical Report shall be adequate.
5. The evaluators' evaluation methodology presented in the Evaluation Technical Report shall conform to the CEM.

Concerns found in the certification process were prepared as the certification oversight reviews, and they were sent to the Evaluation Facility. The Certification Body confirmed such concerns pointed out in the Observation Reports and certification oversight reviews were solved in the ST and the Evaluation Technical Report, and issued this Certification Report.

8.1 Certification Result

As a result of verification of the submitted Evaluation Technical Report, Observation Reports and related evaluation deliverables, the Certification Body determined that the TOE satisfies all assurance requirements for EAL2 in the CC Part 3.

8.2 Recommendations

ST readers shall note that the TOE operators are responsible for protecting the system against eavesdropping of communication data between the TOE and the clients, as described in Section 4.3 "Clarification of Scope."

9 Annexes

There is no annex.

10 Security Target

Security Target [12] of the TOE is provided as a separate document along with this Certification Report.

Microsoft SQL Server 2012 Database Engine Common Criteria Evaluation (EAL2) Security Target, version 1.2, 2012-08-07, Microsoft Corporation

11 Glossary

The abbreviations relating to the CC used in this report are listed below.

CC	Common Criteria for Information Technology Security Evaluation
CEM	Common Methodology for Information Technology Security Evaluation
EAL	Evaluation Assurance Level
PP	Protection Profile
ST	Security Target
TOE	Target of Evaluation
TSF	TOE Security Functionality

The abbreviations relating to the TOE used in this report are listed below.

SQL	Structured Query Language; a database language to operate and define data for relational database.
SID	Security Identifier; a unique identifier that is authorized to a user account or a group managed by Windows OS.

The definitions of terms used in this report are listed below.

System administrator	A role assigned to users with authorized administrator role of the TOE. A system administrator is allowed for any operation related to security management and any operation for all databases. When the TOE is installed, one system administrator account is always generated; however, another user could be authorized to have the system administrator right.
Stored procedure	A series of operating procedures for databases is compiled as one program to store in the database management system.

12 Bibliography

- [1] IT Security Evaluation and Certification Scheme, March 2012, Information-technology Promotion Agency, Japan, CCS-01
- [2] Requirements for IT Security Certification, March 2012, Information-technology Promotion Agency, Japan, CCM-02
- [3] Requirements for Approval of Evaluation Facility, March 2012, Information-technology Promotion Agency, Japan, CCM-03
- [4] Common Criteria for Information Technology Security Evaluation Part 1: Introduction and general model, Version 3.1 Revision 3, July 2009, CCMB-2009-07-001
- [5] Common Criteria for Information Technology Security Evaluation Part 2: Security functional components, Version 3.1 Revision 3, July 2009, CCMB-2009-07-002
- [6] Common Criteria for Information Technology Security Evaluation Part 3: Security assurance components, Version 3.1 Revision 3, July 2009, CCMB-2009-07-003
- [7] Common Criteria for Information Technology Security Evaluation Part 1: Introduction and general model, Version 3.1 Revision 3, July 2009, CCMB-2009-07-001, (Japanese Version 1.0, December 2009)
- [8] Common Criteria for Information Technology Security Evaluation Part 2: Security functional components, Version 3.1 Revision 3, July 2009, CCMB-2009-07-002, (Japanese Version 1.0, December 2009)
- [9] Common Criteria for Information Technology Security Evaluation Part 3: Security assurance components, Version 3.1 Revision 3, July 2009, CCMB-2009-07-003, (Japanese Version 1.0, December 2009)
- [10] Common Methodology for Information Technology Security Evaluation: Evaluation methodology, Version 3.1 Revision 3, July 2009, CCMB-2009-07-004
- [11] Common Methodology for Information Technology Security Evaluation: Evaluation methodology, Version 3.1 Revision 3, July 2009, CCMB-2009-07-004, (Japanese Version 1.0, December 2009)
- [12] Microsoft SQL Server 2012 Database Engine Common Criteria Evaluation (EAL2) Security Target Version 1.2, 2012-08-07, Microsoft Corporation
- [13] Microsoft SQL Server 2012 Database Engine Evaluation Technical Report, Version 2, 2012-08-21, TÜV Informationstechnik GmbH, Evaluation Body for IT-Security