

---

# I-0417: Association Of Information Flow Attributes W/Subjects And Information

---

NUMBER: I-0417  
STATUS: Posted for External Review  
TYPE: NIAP Interpretation

TITLE: Association Of Information Flow Attributes W/Subjects And Information

WOULD SUPERSEDE: Association Of Information Flow Attributes W/Subjects And Information  
[I-0354](#)

COMMENTS DUE BY: Thursday, December 7, 2000 to [IWG@gibraltar.ncsc.mil](mailto:IWG@gibraltar.ncsc.mil)

SOURCE REFERENCE: CC v2.1 Part 2 Subclause 6.6 FDP\_IFF.1.1  
CC v2.1 Part 2 Subclause 6.6 FDP\_IFF.2.1  
CC v2.1 Part 2 Subclause F.6 FDP\_IFF

RELATED TO:  
[I-0353](#) Association Of Access Control Attributes With Subjects And Objects  
[I-0354](#) Association Of Information Flow Attributes W/Subjects And Information  
[I-0416](#) Association Of Access Control Attributes With Subjects And Objects

## ISSUE:

The Common Criteria does not currently provide functional requirements for identifying the clear association of controlled entities (subjects, information) with relevant security attributes. The existing FDP\_IFF family provides only for a simple list of security attributes, without the ability to describe the required association to controlled entities.

## STATEMENT OF INTERPRETATION:

The CC is modified so that the statement of Information Flow Control Policy provides a clear association of controlled entities (subjects, information) with relevant security attributes.

## SPECIFIC INTERPRETATION:

To address this interpretation, the following changes are made to CC v2.1: (additions marked thusly; deletions marked ~~thusly~~):

- The FDP\_IFF.1 component is relabeled as FDP\_IFF.1-NIAP-0417. Unless otherwise noted in these changes, all normative and informative material associated with FDP\_IFF.1 is incorporated unchanged into FDP\_IFF.1-NIAP-0417, and all references to FDP\_IFF.1 in the CC, CEM, or other Common Criteria documentation is changed to refer to FDP\_IFF.1-NIAP-0417.
- The FDP\_IFF.1.1 element is replaced with FDP\_IFF.1.1-NIAP-0417, as follows:

FDP\_IFF.1.1-NIAP-0417: The TSF shall enforce the [assignment: *information flow control SFP*] based on the following types of subject and information security attributes: [assignment: ~~the minimum number and type of security attributes~~ list of subjects and information controlled under the indicated SFP, and for each, the SFP-relevant security attributes]

- The FDP\_IFF.2 component is relabeled as FDP\_IFF.2-NIAP-0417. Unless otherwise noted in these changes, all normative and informative material associated with FDP\_IFF.2 is incorporated unchanged into FDP\_IFF.2-NIAP-0417, and all references to FDP\_IFF.2 in the CC, CEM, or other Common Criteria documentation is changed to refer to FDP\_IFF.2-NIAP-0417.

- The FDP\_IFF.2.1 element is replaced with FDP\_IFF.2.1-NIAP-0417, as follows:

FDP\_IFF.2.1-NIAP-0417: The TSF shall enforce the [assignment: *information flow control SFP*] based on the following types of subject and information security attributes: [assignment: ~~the minimum number and type of security attributes~~ list of subjects and information controlled under the indicated SFP, and for each, the SFP-relevant security attributes]

- Part 2, Subclause F.6, paragraph 810 is replaced by:

In FDP\_IFF.1.1-NIAP-0417, the PP/ST should ~~specify the minimum number and types of security attributes that the function will use in~~ specify, for each type of controlled subject and information, the security attributes that are relevant to the specification of the SFP rules. For example, such security attributes may be things such the subject identifier, subject sensitivity label, subject clearance label, information sensitivity label, etc. The ~~minimum number of each type~~ types of security attributes should be sufficient to support the environmental needs.

- Part 2, Subclause F.6, paragraph 822 is replaced by:

In FDP\_IFF.2.1-NIAP-0417, the PP/ST should ~~specify the minimum number and types of security attributes that the function will use in~~ specify, for each type of controlled subject and information, the security attributes that are relevant to the specification of the SFP rules. For example, such security attributes may be things such the subject identifier, subject sensitivity label, subject clearance label, information sensitivity label, etc. The ~~minimum number of each type~~ types of security attributes should be sufficient to support the environmental needs.

## PROJECTED IMPACT:

Negligible impact anticipated.

## SUPPORT:

This interpretation makes it clear that an appropriate assignment is one that provides, for each controlled entity, the SFP-relevant security attributes of that entity. This might be provided as a two column table: one column is the controlled entity (subject, information), the other is a list of SFP-relevant security attributes for that controlled entity.

Note: This interpretation is superseding a previously-approved formal interpretation primarily to reflect modifications to the interpretation format. The intent of the interpretation has not been changed, although some specifics of the criteria changes or the support may have been clarified or corrected.