

Certification Report

BSI-DSZ-CC-0939-2015

for

**NXP Secure Smart Card Controller
P60D024/016/012PVB(Y/Z/A)/PVF with IC
Dedicated Software**

from

NXP Semiconductors Germany 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-0939-2015 (*)

Smartcard Controller

**NXP Secure Smart Card Controller P60D024/016/012PVB(Y/Z/A)/PVF
with IC Dedicated Software**

from NXP Semiconductors Germany GmbH
PP Conformance: Security IC Platform Protection Profile, Version 1.0,
15 June 2007, BSI-CC-PP-0035-2007
Functionality: PP conformant plus product specific extensions
Common Criteria Part 2 extended
Assurance: Common Criteria Part 3 conformant
EAL 6 augmented by ASE_TSS.2, ALC_FLR.1



SOGIS
Recognition Agreement



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 CC Supporting Documents as listed in the Certification Report for conformance to the Common Criteria for IT Security Evaluation (CC), Version 3.1. CC and CEM are also published as ISO/IEC 15408 and ISO/IEC 18045.

(*) 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 and Notification. For details on the validity see Certification Report part A chapter 4.

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, 15 June 2015

For the Federal Office for Information Security



Common Criteria
Recognition Arrangement
for components up to
EAL 4

Bernd Kowalski
Head of Department

L.S.

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 BSIG¹ 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.....	7
1. Specifications of the Certification Procedure.....	7
2. Recognition Agreements.....	7
3. Performance of Evaluation and Certification.....	9
4. Validity of the Certification Result.....	9
5. Publication.....	10
B. Certification Results.....	11
1. Executive Summary.....	12
2. Identification of the TOE.....	13
3. Security Policy.....	15
4. Assumptions and Clarification of Scope.....	15
5. Architectural Information.....	16
6. Documentation.....	17
7. IT Product Testing.....	17
8. Evaluated Configuration.....	19
9. Results of the Evaluation.....	20
10. Obligations and Notes for the Usage of the TOE.....	21
11. Security Target.....	22
12. Definitions.....	22
13. Bibliography.....	24
C. Excerpts from the Criteria.....	27
CC Part 1:.....	27
CC Part 3:.....	28
D. Annexes.....	35

A. Certification

1. Specifications of the Certification Procedure

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

- Act on the Federal Office for Information Security²
- BSI Certification and Approval Ordinance³
- BSI Schedule of Costs⁴
- Special decrees issued by the Bundesministerium des Innern (Federal Ministry of the Interior)
- DIN EN ISO/IEC 17065 standard
- BSI certification: Technical information on the IT security certification, Procedural Description (BSI 7138) [3]
- BSI certification: Requirements regarding the Evaluation Facility (BSI 7125) [3]
- Common Criteria for IT Security Evaluation (CC), Version 3.1⁵ [1] also published as ISO/IEC 15408.
- Common Methodology for IT Security Evaluation (CEM), Version 3.1 [2] also published as ISO/IEC 18045.
- 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 SOGIS Technical Domains only.

The basic recognition level includes Common Criteria (CC) Evaluation Assurance Levels EAL 1 to EAL 4 and ITSEC Evaluation Assurance Levels E1 to E3 (basic). For

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 Security Certificates and approval by the Federal Office for Information Security (BSI-Zertifizierungs- und -Anerkennungsverordnung - BSIZertV) of 17 December 2014, Bundesgesetzblatt 2014, part I, no. 61, p. 2231

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

"Smartcards and similar devices" a SOGIS Technical Domain is in place. For "HW Devices with Security Boxes" a SOGIS Technical Domains is in place, too. This Domain is linked to a conformance claim to one of the related SOGIS Recommended Protection Profiles. In addition, certificates issued for Protection Profiles based on Common Criteria are part of the recognition agreement.

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.

This certificate is recognized under SOGIS-MRA for all assurance components selected.

2.2. International Recognition of CC – Certificates (CCRA)

The international arrangement on the mutual recognition of certificates based on the CC (Common Criteria Recognition Arrangement, CCRA-2014) has been ratified on 08 September 2014. It covers CC certificates based on collaborative Protection Profiles (cPP) (exact use), certificates based on assurance components up to and including EAL 2 or the assurance family Flaw Remediation (ALC_FLR) and certificates for Protection Profiles and for collaborative Protection Profiles (cPP).

The CCRA-2014 replaces the old CCRA signed in May 2000 (CCRA-2000). Certificates based on CCRA-2000, issued before 08 September 2014 are still under recognition according to the rules of CCRA-2000. For on 08 September 2014 ongoing certification procedures and for Assurance Continuity (maintenance and re-certification) of old certificates a transition period on the recognition of certificates according to the rules of CCRA-2000 (i.e. assurance components up to and including EAL 4 or the assurance family Flaw Remediation (ALC_FLR)) is defined until 08 September 2017.

As of September 2014 the signatories of the new CCRA are government representatives from the following nations: Australia, Austria, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, India, Israel, Italy, Japan, Malaysia, The Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Republic of Korea, Singapore, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom, and the United States.

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.

As the product certified has been accepted into the certification process before 08 September 2014, this certificate is recognized according to the rules of CCRA-2000, i.e. up to and including CC part 3 EAL 4 components. The evaluation contained the components ADV_FSP.5, ADV_IMP.2, ADV_INT.3, ADV_SPM.1, ADV_TDS.5, ALC_CMC.5, ALC_CMS.5, ALC_DVS.2, ALC_TAT.3, ASE_TSS.2, ATE_COV.3, ATE_DPT.3, ATE_FUN.2 and AVA_VAN.5 that are not mutually recognised in accordance with the provisions of the CCRA-2000, for mutual recognition the EAL 4 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 NXP Secure Smart Card Controller P60D024/016/012PVB(Y/Z/A)/PVF with IC Dedicated Software has undergone the certification procedure at BSI.

The evaluation of the product NXP Secure Smart Card Controller P60D024/016/012PVB(Y/Z/A)/PVF with IC Dedicated Software was conducted by TÜV Informationstechnik GmbH. The evaluation was completed on 18 May 2015. TÜV Informationstechnik GmbH is an evaluation facility (ITSEF)⁶ recognised by the certification body of BSI.

For this certification procedure the sponsor and applicant is: NXP Semiconductors Germany GmbH.

The product was developed by: NXP Semiconductors Germany 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

- 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 should 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 order to avoid an indefinite usage of the certificate when evolved attack methods require a re-assessment of the products resistance to state of the art attack methods, the maximum validity of the certificate has been limited. The certificate issued on 15 June 2015 is valid until 14 June 2020. The validity date can be extended by re-assessment or re-certification.

The owner of the certificate is obliged

1. when advertising the certificate or the fact of the product's certification, to refer to the Certification Report as well as to provide the Certification Report and the

⁶ Information Technology Security Evaluation Facility

Security Target and user guidance documentation mentioned herein to any applicant of the product for the application and usage of the certified product,

2. to inform the Certification Body at BSI immediately about vulnerabilities of the product that have been identified by the developer or any third party after issuance of the certificate,
3. to inform the Certification Body at BSI immediately in the case that security relevant changes in the product's evaluated life cycle, e.g. related to development and production sites or processes, occur or the confidentiality of documentation and information related to the product or resulting from the evaluation and certification procedure is not given any longer. In particular, prior to the dissemination of confidential documentation and information related to the product or resulting from the evaluation and certification procedure that do not belong to the product deliverables according to the Certification Report part B chapter 2 to third parties, permission of the Certification Body at BSI has to be obtained.

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 NXP Secure Smart Card Controller P60D024/016/012PVB(Y/Z/A)/PVF with IC Dedicated Software 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 developer⁷ of the product. The Certification Report may also be obtained in electronic form at the internet address stated above.

⁷ NXP Semiconductors Germany GmbH
Stresemannallee 101
22569 Hamburg

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.

1. Executive Summary

The Target of Evaluation (TOE) is the IC hardware platform “NXP Secure Smart Card Controller P60D024/016/012PVB(Y/Z/A)/PVF with IC Dedicated Software”. It is a microcontroller incorporating a central processing unit, memories accessible via a Memory Management Unit, cryptographic coprocessors, other security components and two communication interfaces. On-chip memories are ROM, RAM and EEPROM. The EEPROM is optimized for applications requiring reliable non-volatile data storage for data and program code.

The end-consumer environment of the TOE is phase 7 of the Security IC product life-cycle as defined in [7]. In this phase the Security IC product is in usage by the end-consumer. Its method of use now depends on the Security IC Embedded Software. The TOE can be used to assure authorized conditional access in a wide range of applications. Examples are identity cards, Banking Cards, Pay-TV, Portable communication SIM cards, Health cards and Transportation cards. The end-user environment covers a wide spectrum of very different functions, thus making it difficult to monitor and avoid abuse of the TOE.

The Security Target [6] is the basis for this certification. It is based on the certified Protection Profile Security IC Platform Protection Profile, Version 1.0, 15 June 2007, BSI-CC-PP-0035-2007 [7].

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 6 augmented by ASE_TSS.2, ALC_FLR.1.

The TOE Security Functional Requirements (SFR) relevant for the TOE are outlined in the Security Target [6] and [8], chapter 6.1. 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. The Security Functionality provided by the TOE is split into Security Services (SS) and Security Features (SF):

TOE Security Functionality	Addressed issue
Security Services	
SS.RNG	Random Number Generator
SS.HW_DES	Triple-DES coprocessor
SS.HW_AES	AES coprocessor
SS.Reconfig	Post Delivery Configuration
Security Features	
SF.OPC	Control of Operating Conditions
SF.PHY	Protection against Physical Manipulation
SF.LOG	Logical Protection
SF.COMP	Protection of Mode Control
SF.MEM_ACC	Memory Access Control
SF.SFR_ACC	Special Function Register Access Control

TOE Security Functionality	Addressed issue
SF.FFW	Firmware Firewall
SF.FIRMWARE	Firmware Support

Table 1: TOE Security Functionalities

For more details please refer to the Security Target [6] and [8], chapter 7.

The assets to be protected by the TOE are defined in the Security Target [6] and [8], chapter 3.1. 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 [8], chapter 3.2 to 3.4.

This certification covers the configurations of the TOE as outlined in 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:

NXP Secure Smart Card Controller P60D024/016/012PVB(Y/Z/A)/PVF with IC Dedicated Software

The following table outlines the TOE deliverables:

No	Type	Identifier	Release	Form of Delivery
1	HW	NXP Secure Smart Card Controller P60D024/016/012PVB(Y/Z/A)	nameplate 9047A	wafer, module, inlay or package
		NXP Secure Smart Card Controller P60D024/016/012PVF	nameplate 9047B	wafer, module, inlay or package
2	SW	Test ROM Software (Security IC Dedicated Test Software), Test-ROM on the chip acc. to 9047A_BG002_TESTROM_v1_btos_08v07_fos_5v0.hex	Version 08.07, 21 September, 2011	stored in ROM on the chip
3	SW	Boot ROM Software (part of the Security IC Dedicated Support Software), Boot-ROM on the chip acc. to 9047A_BG002_TESTROM_v1_btos_08v07_fos_5v0.hex	Version 08.07, 21 September, 2011	stored in ROM on the chip
4	SW	PVB(Y): Firmware Operating System (FOS) (part of the Security IC Dedicated Support Software), Firmware Operating System on the chip acc. to 9047A_BG002_TESTROM_v1_btos_08v07_fos_5v0.hex	Version 5.00, 21 September, 2011	stored in ROM on the chip

No	Type	Identifier	Release	Form of Delivery
		PVB(Z/A)/PVF: ⁸ Firmware Operating System on the chip acc. to 9047A_BG002_TESTROM_v1_btos_08v07_fos_5v0.hex	Version 5.00 / 5.03, 21 September, 2011	stored in ROM on the chip
5	DOC	Product Data Sheet, SmartMX2 family P60D024/016/012 VB/VF, Secure high-performance smart card controller, NXP Semiconductors, Business Unit Identification	Rev. 5.2, 27 June 2014	electronic form [12]
6	DOC	Instruction set for the SmartMX2 family, Secure smart card controller, NXP Semiconductors, Business Unit Identification	Rev. 3.1, 2 February 2012	electronic form [13]
7	DOC	NXP Secure Smart Card Controller P60D024/016/012 VB/VF, Information on Guidance and Operation, Guidance and Operation Manual	Rev. 1.6, 12 December 2014	electronic form [14]
8	DOC	Wafer and delivery specification, SmartMX2 family P60D024/016/012 VB/VF, NXP Semiconductors	Rev. 3.2, 23 May 2014	electronic form [15]
9	DOC	Product Data Sheet Addendum, SmartMX2 family, Post Delivery Configuration, NXP Semiconductors	Rev. 3.2, 04 February 2013	electronic form [16]
10	DOC	Product Data Sheet Addendum, SmartMX2 family Chip Health Mode, NXP Semiconductors	Rev. 3.0, 11 May 2012	electronic form [17]
11	DOC	Product Data Sheet Addendum, SmartMX2 family, Firmware Interface Specification, Firmware, NXP Semiconductors	Rev. 4.1, 25 June 2014	electronic form [18]

Table 2: Deliverables of the TOE

The requirements for the delivery of TOE are described in chapter 2 of the “Guidance and Operation Manual” [14] and in chapter 4 of the “Wafer and delivery specification” [15]. For each delivery form of the hardware platform NXP offers two ways of delivery of the TOE:

1. The customer collects the hardware platform himself at the NXP site.
2. The hardware platform is sent to the customer by NXP with special protective measures.

The TOE documentation (last seven items of Table 3) is delivered in electronic form by the document control centre of NXP.

The commercial type name is the identification used to order the TOE in the respective major configuration and with the evaluated package type. In consequence this means that a full commercial product name that fits in the variable forms described in Table 8 of [6] determines that the hardware platform is an evaluated product. In addition the hardware version can be identified by the crypted nameplate "9047A", respectively "9047B" for PVF (cf. [11], 3.1) on the surface of the hardware platform as described in chapters 4.2 and 3.9.3 of the Wafer and delivery specification [15]. The nameplate is the same for all configurations. In addition each major configuration has a different device coding described in [12] section 31.2. The device coding is reproduced in the following Table 3.

Identification is also possible using the Chip Health Mode. The identification string provided by the command 00h of the Chip Health Mode comprises also the device coding and the firmware version.

⁸ FOS Version 5.03 includes extensions on top of 9047A_BG002_TESTROM_v1_btos_08v07_fos_5v0.hex stored in the Firmware Mode EEPROM

Each major configuration has a dedicated device coding as listed in the following table:

	P60D024PVB(Y/Z/A)/ PVF	P60D016PVB(Y/Z/A)/ PVF	P60D012PVB(Y/Z/A)/ PVF	
DC0	22h	22h	22h	
DC1	0Ch	0Bh	0Ah	
DC2	00h	00h	00h	
DC3	17h	17h	17h	Options
DC4	yyxx xxxx	yyxx xxxx	yyxx xxxx	EEPROM programming characteristics: yy=00: TSMC ver. a yy=01: TSMC ver. b yy=10: reserved yy=11: reserved
	xxxx 1xxx	xxxx 1xxx	xxxx 1xxx	NXP option PATDET configuration selection set to "a"
	xxxx 0xxx	xxxx 0xxx	xxxx 0xxx	NXP option PATDET configuration selection set to "initial"
	xxxx x1xx	xxxx x1xx	xxxx x1xx	Start-up with Run mode disabled
	xxxx x0xx	xxxx x0xx	xxxx x0xx	Start-up with Run mode enabled
	xxxx xxx1	xxxx xxx1	xxxx xxx1	LA / LB input capacitance, Class 2 (half ID1) antenna
	xxxx xxx0	xxxx xxx0	xxxx xxx0	LA / LB input capacitance, Class 1 (ID1) antenna

Table 3: Device coding of the major configurations

3. Security Policy

The Security Policy is expressed by the set of Security Functional Requirements and implemented by the TOE. As the TOE is a security hardware platform, the security policy of the TOE provides countermeasures against: leakage of information, physical probing, malfunctions, physical manipulations, access to code, access to data memory, abuse of functionality. Hence the TOE shall:

- maintain the integrity and the confidentiality of data stored in the memory of the TOE and
- maintain the integrity, the correct operation and the confidentiality of Security Functions (security mechanisms and associated functions) provided by the TOE.

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:

- Clarification of “Usage of Hardware Platform (OE.Plat-Appl)”
- Clarification of “Treatment of User Data (OE.Resp-Appl)”
- Protection during composite product manufacturing (OE.Process-Sec-IC)
- Check of initialisation data by the Security IC Embedded Software (OE.Check-Init)

Details can be found in the Security Target [6] and [8], chapter 4.2 and 4.3.

5. Architectural Information

The NXP Secure Smart Card Controller P60D024/016/012PVB(Y/Z/A)/PVF with IC Dedicated Software is a microcontroller incorporating a central processing unit, memories accessible via a Memory Management Unit, cryptographic coprocessors, other security components and two communication interfaces. The central processing unit supports a 32-/24-/16-/8-bit instruction set optimized for smart card applications, which is a super set of the 80C51 family instruction set. The first and in some cases the second byte of an instruction are used for operation encoding. On-chip memories are ROM, RAM and EEPROM. The non-volatile EEPROM can be used as data or program memory. It consists of high reliable memory cells, which guarantee data integrity. The EEPROM is optimized for applications requiring reliable non-volatile data storage for data and program code. EEPROM double read function is included for correct memory readout. Dedicated security functionality protects the contents of all memories.

The IC Dedicated Software comprises IC Dedicated Test Software for test purposes and IC Dedicated Support Software. The IC Dedicated Support Software consists of Boot-ROM Software controlling the boot process of the hardware platform and Firmware Operating System which can be called by the Security IC Embedded Software. The Firmware Operating System provides an interface for programming of the internal EEPROM memory, which is mandatory for use by the Security IC Embedded Software when programming the EEPROM memory.

Users have the possibility to tailor the available crypto co-processor, which is also part of the TOE, during the ordering process by deselecting the Symmetric Block Cipher Interfaces. Hence the TOE can be delivered with or without the functionality of 3DES and AES, respectively. In case of deactivation, the accompanying additional specific security functionality 3DES and AES is not provided to the end consumer by the TOE. Deselecting the Symmetric Block Cipher Interfaces has no impact on any other security policy of the TOE; it is exactly equivalent to the situation where the user decides just not to use the functionality. Also the Fame2 coprocessor (for large number arithmetics) can be deactivated during the life cycle phases 5 and 6 (post delivery configuration), which results in the fact that the dedicated hardware support for asymmetric calculations cannot be used. In either case, a software cryptographic library is not part of the TOE and thus not in scope of the evaluation. Besides the crypto coprocessor blocking, the user has also the possibility to block the above mentioned memory size of the EEPROM and RAM and choose between different interface options. This has no influence to the security policy of the TOE.

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 tests performed can be divided into the following categories:

7.1. Developer's Test according to ATE_FUN

Testing has been performed by the developer according to a documented testing approach, covering well defined TOE configurations and various categories of tests, thereby covering the whole TOE security functionality.

The developer's testing results demonstrate that the TOE in general and its TSFs behave as expected and specified.

TOE test configuration and developer's testing approach:

- The tests are performed with the TOE in different test environments and configurations depending on the test categories.
- All TSF and a relevant subset of related security mechanisms, subsystems and modules are tested in order to assure complete coverage of all SFR.

Test categories:

- Production testing on wafers using test functions implemented in the IC Dedicated Software. These test functions are accessed via test commands, which are issued by the production tests. Test functions respond signatures to the production tests. Production tests also apply signals to and/or measures signals at any contact of the device. Final test or module test therefore is limited to a verification of electrical connections like checking the pins of the package for shorts and opens.
- Simulation tests are performed to verify functionality, which is not visible at the accessible interfaces of the TOE. These simulation tests are a subset of those, which were performed during development of the device to ensure a proper design of its modules.

During run-time of a simulation an automated regression test continuously compares pre-defined internal signals (probe list) like data and address buses, control signals, register contents and microcode information against a "golden reference". Test results are automatically listed in log files and a summary, i.e. discrepancies occurred (yes/no), is output to the user interface.

Manual simulation tests are performed in case an automated result comparison based on executable code is not possible.

- Characterization tests verify the electrical properties of the device, which are specified with regard to limiting values, thresholds and timings of several electrical parameters like voltages, currents, frequencies, capacitors,

resistances and latches. For this purpose a number of devices for test are taken from production.

- Verification tests are performed on single samples of the device to verify specific security functionality, which is not testable for each device during production test or within the scope of characterization testing. Such tests include standard tests of the Random Number Generator, AES coprocessor and Triple-DES coprocessor.
- Test of configurations: Configuration data are stored to EEPROM based on the customer's choices in the Order Entry Form at later stages of the production test. For this purpose production test implements special test steps relying on an according test strategy to verify the required configuration. Special parts of verification tests explicitly test the configuration options of the device.

7.2. Independent Testing according to ATE_IND

The whole TOE security functionality was tested by the evaluator by utilizing a documented test approach, which covered well defined TOE configurations as well as various categories of tests.

As a result, the evaluator's testing results demonstrate that the TOE in general and its TSFs behave as expected and specified.

The independent testing was partly performed in the developer's testing environment and partly at TÜViT GmbH, information security department, in Essen. The same platforms and tools as for the developer tests were used (see ATE_FUN one section above).

Testing approach:

- The evaluator's objective regarding this aspect was to test the functionality of the TOE, and to verify the developer's test results by repeating developer's tests and additionally add independent tests.
- In the course of the evaluation of the TOE the following classes of tests were carried out:
 - Module tests,
 - Simulation tests,
 - Emulation tests,
 - Tests in user mode,
 - Tests in test mode,
 - Hardware tests.

With this kind of tests the entire security functionality of the TOE was tested.

7.3. Penetration Testing according to AVA_VAN

The penetration testing was partially performed using the developer's testing environment, partially using the test environment of the evaluation body.

All configurations of the TOE being intended to be covered by the current evaluation were tested. The overall test result is that no deviations were found between the expected and the actual test results; moreover, no attack scenario with the attack potential high was actually successful.

Penetration testing approach:

- Systematic search for potential vulnerabilities and known attacks in public domain sources, use of a list of vulnerabilities, and from a methodical analysis of the evaluation documents.
- Analysis why these vulnerabilities are unexploitable in the intended environment of the TOE.
- If the rationale is suspect in the opinion of the evaluator penetration tests are devised.
- Even if the rationale is convincing in the opinion of the evaluator penetration tests are devised for some vulnerabilities, especially to support the argument of non-practicability of exploiting time in case of SPA, DPA and FI attacks.
- The tests are performed with the chip P60D024/016/012PVB(Y/Z/A)/PVF. For the tests different chip types are prepared with different patch. With the loaded patch code the defined tests could be performed. The entire functionality is the same for all chips.

8. Evaluated Configuration

The NXP Secure Smart Card Controller P60D024/016/012PVB(Y/Z/A)/PVF with IC Dedicated Software can be delivered in different major configurations. All major configurations listed in the following table are covered by this evaluation

	P60D024PVB(Y/Z/A) /PVF	P60D016PVB(Y/Z/A) /PVF	P60D012PVB(Y/Z/A) /PVF
accessible EEPROM for the Security IC Embedded Software	24 kBytes except for 512 Bytes reserved for Security Rows and configuration data of the manufacturer and 768 Bytes reserved for IC Dedicated Support Software (Firmware OS)	16 kBytes except for 512 Bytes reserved for Security Rows and configuration data of the manufacturer and 768 Bytes reserved for IC Dedicated Support Software (Firmware OS)	12 kBytes except for 512 Bytes reserved for Security Rows and configuration data of the manufacturer and 768 Bytes reserved for IC Dedicated Support Software (Firmware OS)
Contactless communication according to ISO/IEC 14443 A	contactless interface enabled	contactless interface enabled	contactless interface enabled
ROM available to the Security IC Embedded Software	352 kBytes	352 kBytes	352 kBytes

Table 4: Overview of major configurations

The NXP Secure Smart Card Controller P60D024/016/012PVB(Y/Z/A)/PVF with IC Dedicated Software was tested including all major configurations as well as all minor configuration options that can be selected based on Table 7 in chapter 1.4.2.2 of [6] and [8]. All major and minor configurations are available to the evaluator. Besides the differences listed in above table there are no other differences between the major configurations. The major configuration does not have dependencies to security features. All minor configuration options that are part of the evaluation were tested. The minor configuration options behave as specified and described in [6] and [8] as well.

Therefore the results described in this document are applicable for the listed major configurations as well as for all minor configurations described in [6] and [8].

The major and minor configurations cannot be influenced by the customer. They are selected by the customer according to the Order Entry Form [21], [22] and [23]. This configuration cannot be changed in the Application Mode after delivery of the TOE.

9. Results of the Evaluation

9.1. CC specific results

The Evaluation Technical Report (ETR) [9] 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 EAL5 extended by advice of the Certification Body for components beyond EAL 5 and guidance specific for the technology of the product [4] (AIS 34).

The following guidance specific for the technology was used:

- (i) *The Application of CC to Integrated Circuits*
- (ii) *Application of Attack Potential to Smartcards*
- (iii) *Guidance, Smartcard Evaluation*

(see [4], AIS 25, AIS 26, AIS 37).

For RNG assessment the scheme interpretations AIS 31 was used (see [4]).

To support composite evaluations according to AIS 36 the document ETR for composite evaluation [10] was provided and approved. This document provides details of this platform evaluation that have to be considered in the course of a composite evaluation on top.

The assurance refinements outlined in the Security Target were followed in the course of the evaluation of the TOE.

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

- All components of the EAL 6 package including the class ASE as defined in the CC (see also part C of this report)
- The components ASE_TSS.2, ALC_FLR.1 augmented for this TOE evaluation.

The evaluation has confirmed:

- PP Conformance: Security IC Platform Protection Profile, Version 1.0, 15 June 2007, BSI-CC-PP-0035-2007 [7]
- for the Functionality: PP conformant plus product specific extensions
Common Criteria Part 2 extended
- for the Assurance: Common Criteria Part 3 conformant
EAL 6 augmented by ASE_TSS.2, ALC_FLR.1

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 strength of the cryptographic algorithms was not rated in the course of this certification procedure (see BSIG Section 9, Para. 4, Clause 2). But Cryptographic Functionalities with a security level of lower than 100 bits can no longer be regarded as secure without considering the application context. Therefore, for these functionalities it shall be checked whether the related crypto operations are appropriate for the intended system. Some further hints and guidelines can be derived from the 'Technische Richtlinie BSI TR-02102' (<https://www.bsi.bund.de>).

Any Cryptographic Functionality that is marked in column '*Security Level above 100 Bits*' of the following table with '*no*' achieves a security level of lower than 100 Bits (in general context).

Purpose	Cryptographic Mechanism	Standard of Implementation	Key Size in Bits	Security Level above 100 Bits
Cryptographic Primitives	Two-key TDES	[FIPS-46-3] (DES)	K = 112	no
	Three-key TDES	[FIPS-46-3] (DES)	K = 168	yes
	AES	[FIPS-197] (AES)	K = 128, 192, 256	yes

Table 5: TOE cryptographic functionality

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 of the TOE is required and thus requested from the sponsor of the certificate.

Some security measures are partly implemented in this certified TOE, but require additional configuration or control or measures to be implemented by a product layer on top, e.g. the using the TOE. For this reason the TOE includes guidance documentation (see table 2) which contains obligations and guidelines for the developer of the product layer on top on how to securely use this certified TOE and which measures have to be implemented in order to fulfil the security requirements of the Security Target of the TOE. In the course of the evaluation of the composite product or system it must be examined if the required measures have been correctly and effectively implemented by the product layer on top. Additionally, the evaluation of the composite product or system must also consider the evaluation results as outlined in the document ETR for composite evaluation [10].

11. Security Target

For the purpose of publishing, the Security Target [8] 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

AES	Advanced Encryption Standard
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
CPU	Central Processing Unit
CRC	Cyclic Redundancy Check
DES	Data Encryption Standard
cPP	Collaborative Protection Profile
EAL	Evaluation Assurance Level
EEPROM	Electrically Erasable Programmable Read Only Memory
ETR	Evaluation Technical Report
IT	Information Technology
IC	Integrated Circuit
IEC	International Electrotechnical Commission
ISO	International Organization for Standardization
ITSEF	Information Technology Security Evaluation Facility
PP	Protection Profile
RAM	Random Access Memory
ROM	Read Only Memory
SAR	Security Assurance Requirement
SFP	Security Function Policy
SFR	Security Functional Requirement
ST	Security Target
TDES	Triple Data Encryption Standard

TOE	Target of Evaluation
TSF	TOE Security Functionality

12.2. Glossary

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

Collaborative Protection Profile - A Protection Profile collaboratively developed by an International Technical Community endorsed by the Management Committee.

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

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

Informal - Expressed in natural language.

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

Package - named set of either security functional or security assurance requirements

Protection Profile - A formal document defined in CC, expressing an implementation independent set of security requirements for a category of IT Products that meet specific consumer needs.

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 - An IT Product and its associated administrator and user guidance documentation that is the subject of an Evaluation.

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 4, September 2012
Part 2: Security functional components, Revision 4, September 2012
Part 3: Security assurance components, Revision 4, September 2012
- [2] Common Methodology for Information Technology Security Evaluation (CEM), Evaluation Methodology, Version 3.1, Rev. 4, September 2012
- [3] BSI certification: Technical information on the IT security certification of products, protection profiles and sites (BSI 7138) and Requirements regarding the Evaluation Facility for the Evaluation of Products, Protection Profiles and Sites under the CC and ITSEC (BSI 7125)
- [4] Application Notes and Interpretations of the Scheme (AIS) as relevant for the TOE⁹.
- [5] German IT Security Certificates (BSI 7148), periodically updated list published also in the BSI Website
- [6] Security Target BSI-DSZ-CC-0939-2015, NXP Secure Smart Card Controller P60D024/016/012PVB(Y/Z/A)/PVF Security Target, NXP Semiconductors, Version 3.1, 09 December 2014 (confidential document)
- [7] Security IC Platform Protection Profile, Version 1.0, 15 June 2007, BSI-CC-PP-0035-2007
- [8] Security Target Lite BSI-DSZ-CC-0939-2015, NXP Secure Smart Card Controller P60D024/016/012PVB(Y/Z/A)/PVF Security Target Lite, NXP Semiconductors, Version 3.1, 09 December 2014
- [9] Evaluation Technical Report, TÜV Informationstechnik GmbH, Version 7, 24 April 2015 (confidential document)
- [10] Evaluation Technical Report FOR COMPOSITE EVALUATION Version 6, 24 April 2015 (confidential document)

⁹specifically

- AIS 25, Version 8, Anwendung der CC auf Integrierte Schaltungen including JIL Document and CC Supporting Document
- AIS 26, Version 9, Evaluationsmethodologie für in Hardware integrierte Schaltungen including JIL Document and CC Supporting Document
- AIS 31, Version 3, Funktionalitätsklassen und Evaluationsmethodologie für physikalische Zufallszahlengeneratoren
- AIS 32, Version 7, CC-Interpretationen im deutschen Zertifizierungsschema
- AIS 34, Version 3, Evaluation Methodology for CC Assurance Classes for EAL 5+ (CCv2.3 & CCv3.1) and EAL 6 (CCv3.1)
- AIS 35, Version 1, Öffentliche Fassung des Security Targets (ST-Lite) including JIL Document and CC Supporting Document and CCRA policies
- AIS 36, Version 4, Kompositionsevaluierung including JIL Document and CC Supporting Document
- AIS 38, Version 2, Reuse of evaluation results

- [11] NXP Secure Smart Card Controller P60D024/016/012PVB(Y/Z/A)/PVF, Configuration List, NXP Semiconductors, Business Unit Identification, NXP Semiconductors, Rev. 2.41, 10 October 2014 (confidential document)
- [12] Product Data Sheet, SmartMX2 family P60D024/016/012 VB/VF, Secure high-performance smart card controller, NXP Semiconductors, Rev. 5.2, 27 June 2014 (confidential document)
- [13] Instruction set for the SmartMX2 family, Secure smart card controller, NXP Semiconductors, Business Unit Identification, Rev. 3.1, 02 February 2012 (confidential document)
- [14] NXP Secure Smart Card Controller P60D012/016/024P VB/VF, Information on Guidance and Operation, Guidance and Operation Manual, NXP Semiconductors, Rev. 1.6, 12 December 2014 (confidential document)
- [15] SmartMX2 family P60D024/016/012 VB/VF, Wafer and delivery specification, Product data sheet addendum, NXP Semiconductors, Rev. 3.2, 23 May 2014 (confidential document)
- [16] SmartMX2 family Post Delivery Configuration (PDC), Secure high-performance smart card controller, Product data sheet addendum, NXP Semiconductors, Rev. 3.2, 04 February 2013 (confidential document)
- [17] SmartMX2 family Chip Health Mode (CHM), Secure high-performance smart card controller, Product data sheet addendum, NXP Semiconductors, Rev. 3.0, 11 May 2012 (confidential document)
- [18] Firmware interface specification, Firmware, Product data sheet addendum, NXP Semiconductors, Rev. 4.1, 25 June 2014 (confidential document)
- [19] NXP Secure Smart Card Controller P60D024/016/012PVB(Y/Z/A)/PVF and NXP Secure Smart Card Controller P60D024/016/012MVB(Y/Z/A)/yVF, Evaluation Reference List, NXP Semiconductors, Business Unit Identification, Rev. 3.17, 02 February 2015 (confidential document)
- [20] NXP Secure Smart Card Controller P60D024/016/012PVB(Y/Z/A)/PVF and NXP Secure Smart Card Controller P60D024/016/012MVB(Y/Z/A)/yVF, Customer specific Appendix of the Configuration List, NXP Semiconductors, Business Unit Identification, Rev. 2.20, 04 November 2013 (confidential document)
- [21] Order Entry Form P60D024, NXP Semiconductors, Release: 2.22
- [22] Order Entry Form P60D016, NXP Semiconductors, Release: 2.18
- [23] Order Entry Form P60D012, NXP Semiconductors, Release: 2.17

This page is intentionally left blank.

C. Excerpts from the Criteria

CC Part 1:

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
	AGD: Guidance documents
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

Assurance Class	Assurance Components
	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_COV.1 Evidence of coverage ATE_COV.2 Analysis of coverage ATE_COV.3 Rigorous analysis of coverage
ATE: Tests	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.

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

“Objectives

EAL 1 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.

EAL 1 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.

EAL 1 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 EAL 1 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 (EAL 2) - structurally tested (chapter 8.4)

“Objectives

EAL 2 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.

EAL 2 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 (EAL 3) - methodically tested and checked (chapter 8.5)

“Objectives

EAL 3 permits a conscientious developer to gain maximum assurance from positive security engineering at the design stage without substantial alteration of existing sound development practises.

EAL 3 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 (EAL 4) - methodically designed, tested, and reviewed (chapter 8.6)

“Objectives

EAL 4 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. EAL 4 is the highest level at which it is likely to be economically feasible to retrofit to an existing product line.

EAL 4 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 (EAL 5) - semiformally designed and tested (chapter 8.7)

“Objectives

EAL 5 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 EAL 5 assurance. It is likely that the additional costs attributable to the EAL 5 requirements, relative to rigorous development without the application of specialised techniques, will not be large.

EAL 5 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 (EAL 6) - semiformally verified design and tested (chapter 8.8)

“Objectives

EAL 6 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.

EAL 6 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 (EAL 7) - formally verified design and tested (chapter 8.9)

“Objectives

EAL 7 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 EAL 7 is currently limited to TOEs with tightly focused security functionality that is amenable to extensive formal analysis.”

Assurance Class	Assurance Family	Assurance Components by Evaluation Assurance Level						
		EAL 1	EAL 2	EAL 3	EAL 4	EAL 5	EAL 6	EAL 7
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”

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.”

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

This page is intentionally left blank.

Annex B of Certification Report BSI-DSZ-CC-0939-2015

Evaluation results regarding development and production environment



The IT product NXP Secure Smart Card Controller P60D024/016/012PVB(Y/Z/A)/PVF with IC Dedicated Software (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 5 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 15 June 2015, the following results regarding the development and production environment apply. The Common Criteria assurance requirements ALC – Life cycle support (i.e. ALC_CMC.5, ALC_CMS.5, ALC_DEL.1, ALC_DVS.2, ALC_FLR.1, ALC_LCD.1, ALC_TAT.3)

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

Development site	Task within the evaluation
NXP Semiconductors Hamburg Business Unit Identification (BU ID) Stresemannallee 101 22529 Hamburg Germany	Development, Delivery and customer support
TSMC, Fab 2 and 5 No. 121 Park Ave. III Hsinchu Science Park Hsinchu, Taiwan 300, R.O.C.	Mask data preparation
TSMC, Fab 7 No. 6, Creation Rd. II Hsinchu Science Park Hsinchu, Taiwan 300, R.O.C.	Mask data preparation
TSMC, Fab 6 and Fab 14 No. 1, Nan-Ke North Rd. Tainan Science Park Tainan, Taiwan 741, R.O.C.	Mask and wafer production
Chipbond Technology Corporation No. 3, Li-Hsin Rd. V Science Based Industrial Park Hsin-Chu City Taiwan, R.O.C.	Bumping
NXP Semiconductors GmbH Hamburg Test Center Europe - Hamburg (TCE-H)	Test Center and configuration of the Fabkey

Development site	Task within the evaluation
<p>Stresemannallee 101 22529 Hamburg Germany</p>	
<p>Assembly Plant Bangkok 303 Moo 3 Chaengwattana Rd. Laksi, Bangkok 10210 Thailand</p>	<p>Test Center, Delivery and Module assembly</p>
<p>Assembly Plant Kaohsiung NXP Semiconductors Taiwan Ltd #10, Jing 5th Road, N.E.P.Z, Kaohsiung 81170 Taiwan, R.O.C</p>	<p>Test Center and Module assembly</p>
<p>SMARTRAC Technology Ltd. 142 Moo 1 Hi-Tech Industrial Estate Tambon Ban Laean, Amphor Bang-Pa-In 13160 Ayutthaya Thailand</p>	<p>Inlay assembly</p>
<p>SMARTRAC Technology Wehnrath GmbH Gewerbeparkstr. 10 51580 Reichshof-Wehnrath Germany</p>	<p>Inlay assembly</p>
<p>HID Global Teoranta Paic Tionscail na Tulaigh Balle na hAbhann Co. Galway Ireland</p>	<p>Inlay assembly</p>
<p>NXP Semiconductors Austria GmbH Styria Business Unit Identification (BU ID) Mikron-Weg 1 8108 Gratkorn Austria</p>	<p>Document control</p>
<p>NedCard B.V. Bijsterhuizen 25-29 6604 LM Wijchen The Netherlands</p>	<p>Module assembly</p>
<p>NedCard (Shanghai) Microelectronics Co. Ltd. Standardized Plant Building #8 No. 789 Puxing Road Caohejing Hi-Tech Park, EPZ 201114 Shanghai People's Republic of China</p>	<p>Module assembly</p>
<p>NXP Semiconductors Netherlands B.V. Gerstweg 2 6534AE Nijmegen The Netherlands</p>	<p>Development and Manufacturing</p>

Development site	Task within the evaluation
NXP High Tech Campus Building 60, High Tech Campus Secure Room 131 5656AE, Eindhoven The Netherlands	Regional Quality Center - Europe, Tape Out Office, and Materials Management Department
Atos Bydgoszcz Building BETA Secure Room B20S1 Biznes Park ul. Kraszewskiego 1 85-240 Bydgoszcz Poland	IT Engineering and Generic Support
Ardentec Corporation (T Site) Ardentec Corporation No. 3, Gungye 3rd Rd. Hsin-Chu Industrial Park, Hu-Kou, Hsin-Chu Hsien Taiwan 30351, R.O.C.	Wafer Testing
Ardentec Corporation (K Site), No. 24, Wen-Huan Rd., Hsin-Chu Industrial Park, Hu-Kou, Hsin-Chu Hsien, Taiwan 30351,R.O.C.	Wafer Processing

For the sites listed above, the requirements have been specifically applied in accordance with the Security Target [6]. 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 [8]) are fulfilled by the procedures of these sites.

This page is intentionally left blank.