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# Tasks of the Evaluation

## Target of Evaluation

### Target of Evaluation (TOE), ##TOE name (short)

Target of evaluation (TOE) of this evaluation technical report (ETR) is the product ##TOE name (long). The TOE is a POI payment terminal of the vendor ##Sponsor (long). Add short description like for instance: The TOE is a payment terminal with Integrated Circuit (IC) Card based online and offline transaction capabilities. The TOE is a Point-of-Interaction (POI) that manages transaction data, provides external communications and secure pin entry capabilities. The TOE includes security features used by payment applications, but the payment applications themselves are not part of the TOE. Any other part of the ##TOE name (long) like other functionalities than payment, which might be processed by the device, e.g. loyalty card processing, are also out of scope of the TOE and thus out of scope of the Security Architecture, Security Target and therefore, out of scope of the evaluation process.

Add further information about the commercial environment and use cases of the terminal and its place in the product line of the vendor.

E.g. attend/unattended, standalone/distributes architecture/to be integrated in vending machines, PIN entry on touch screen, contactless payment, third party apps, multimedia capabilities for marketing purposes, …

Add an image of the whole TOE

According to the Work Unit [AGD\_OPE.1-1] the evaluator has to examine the operational user guidance of the TOE whether it describes, for each user role, the user-accessible functions and privileges that should be controlled in a secure processing environment, including appropriate warnings. In Common Criteria evaluations for POIs, one user role is the payment application developer.

To securely use the TOE, the following guidance documents are to be considered by the payment application developer:

Add a list of all documents needed by the user of the terminal platform (application developer user guidance, correct usage of TOE security functionalities by applications, etc.) or equivalent description.

## Participating Persons

The following parties were involved in the evaluation:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Applicant:** | ##Developer (short) |
| **Certification Body** | Common.SECC |
| **Evaluation Facility / Evaluators:** | ##Evaluation facility,##Evaluation facility address line 1##Evaluation facility address line 2,##Evaluation facility Phone |
|  | Name | Role and task |
|  | Add names of participants | ##Head evaluator, ##Project Management  |
|  | … | … |
|  | … | … |

Table 1 Participants

## Evaluation Documents

The evaluation is based on the following documents:

### References of the Common Criteria Standard and all relevant CC Supporting Documents

 Common Criteria, Part 1: Common Criteria for Information Technology Security Evaluation, Part 1: Introduction and General Model, Version 3.1, Revision 5, April 2017, CCMB-2017-04-001

 Common Criteria, Part 2: Common Criteria for Information Technology Security Evaluation, Part 2: Security Functional Components, Version 3.1, Revision 5, April 2017, CCMB-2017-04-002

 Common Criteria, Part 3: Common Criteria for Information Technology Security Evaluation, Part 3: Security Assurance Components, Version 3.1, Revision 5, April 2017, CCMB-2017-04-003

 Common Methodology for Information Technology Security Evaluation, Evaluation Methodology, Version 3.1, Revision 5, April 2017, CCMB-2017-04-004

 Attack Methods for POIs, Version 1.95, February 2015, JTEMS

 Application of Attack Potential to POIs, Version 1.92, August 2014, JTEMS.

 Terminals Evaluation Methodology – CEM refinement, Version 1.0, May 2011, JTEMS

### References of Common.SECC

 Common Security Evaluation & Certification Consortium Rule Book, Certification Scheme, Version 1.7, 1 April 2019

 Annex 1: Common Criteria Evaluation of POIs – Best Practice, Common Security Evaluation Consortium, Version 1.2, 16 January 2018

 Annex 2: Security Requirements for POI Site Audits, Common Security Evaluation Consortium, Version 2.0, 29 November 2018

 Annex 3: Rules to perform a POI Platform CC-Evaluation, Common Security Evaluation Consortium Version 2.0, 29 November 2018

 Annex 4: Common.SECC Source Code Analysis Requirements, version 0.91 (for trial use), 16 January 2018

 Annex 5: Wording for a Re-assessment Statement, version 1.0, 29 November 2018

 Annex 6: Common.SECC Modular Evaluation Approach, version 1.0, 29 November 2018

### Basis of the Evaluation Process

The current evaluation is Add type of evaluation. Is it an initial evaluation or a re-evaluation? In case of re-evaluation add a description of the preliminary analysis of the vendor IAR document. Explain scope of evaluation (minor or major in sense of CC, see <https://www.commoncriteriaportal.org/files/operatingprocedures/2012-06-01.pdf>).

The evaluation is based on the associated Security Target:

* Security Target ##TOE name (long), ##Title, ##Date, ##Version, [ST].

The ST of the TOE claims Add type of conformance. If type of conformance is not strict add rational:

* Point of Interaction Protection Profile, Date: 6th March, 2015, Version 4.0, [POI PP] in the Add type of configuration.

## Identification of the TOE by the User

According to Common Criteria, Part 1: Common Criteria for Information Technology Security Evaluation, Part 1: Introduction and General Model, Version 3.1, Revision 5, section A.2, a mandatory content of the ST is the ST introduction which has to include the ST reference, TOE reference, TOE overview and the TOE description.

Add the exact sections of the ST which are clearly referring to the ST reference, TOE reference, TOE overview and the TOE description to unambiguously identify the TOE.

The TOE consists of hardware and software. In particular the TOE version is specified by the following configuration information:

|  |
| --- |
| ##TOE name (short) |
| Hardware version: | ##HW version with wildcards |
| Firmware version: | ##FW version with wildcards |

Table 2 TOE reference

According to the CEM in Work Unit ASE\_INT.1-3 the evaluator determines that the TOE reference uniquely identifies the TOE, so that it is clear to which TOE the ST refers, and that it also identifies the version of the TOE, e.g. by including a version/release/build number, or a date of release.

Add a short description of the TOE identification from the Work Unit ASE\_INT.1-3 here

In the Work Units ALC\_CMC.2-1, ATE\_FUN.1-3, ATE\_IND.2-1 and AVA\_POI.1-1 the evaluator has to examine whether the TOE configuration and provided samples for vulnerability analysis and functional testing are consistent with the TOE reference in the ST.

## Concluding Verdict of the Evaluation Facility

Add final verdict of overall evaluation result and, if applicable, refer to any observation reports or residual vulnerabilities.

# Lists of the Single Evaluation Reports

The single evaluation reports as listed below are conformant to the Common.SECC requirements for evaluation reports.

The following evaluation reports were produced and had the following results:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Single Evaluation Report** | **Result** |
| Single Evaluation Report CC Aspect ASE, ##TOE name (short), ##Version, ##Date, ##Evaluation facility | ##Result |
| Single Evaluation Report CC Aspect AGD-ADV, ##TOE name (short), ##Version, ##Date, ##Evaluation facility | ##Result |
| Single Evaluation Report CC Aspect ALC, ##TOE name (short), ##Version, ##Date, ##Evaluation facility | ##Result |
| Single Evaluation Report CC Aspect ATE, ##TOE name (short), ##Version, ##Date, ##Evaluation facility | ##Result |
| Single Evaluation Report CC Aspect AVA\_POI, ##TOE name (short), ##Version, ##Date, ##Evaluation facility | ##Result |

Table 3 Single Evaluation Reports