

CSP and WASM

Current state and proposal

What is CSP (Content Security Policy)?

- Content Security Policy
 - Allows websites (servers) to restrict client-side loading of resources in order to mitigate cross-site scripting attacks (XSS)
 - Directives can restrict from where pages are allowed to load **scripts** and other resources
 - Can specify expected hashes to ensure resource integrity from 3rd party CDNs
- Relevance to WASM
 - CSP can be used to restrict the *source of code* running on a site (**script-src**)
 - Can disable JavaScript language features: **eval**
 - By default, disabling JavaScript's **eval** also disables WebAssembly compile APIs
 - Browsers should align to define the restrictions appropriate for WASM
 - Policy choices can and should differ for WASM (reasons)

A CSP Example

- Content Security Policy directives can be part of an HTTP response header
 - Content-Security-Policy: script-src <https://example.com/>
 - This restricts script tags within the document
 - `<script src="https://not-example.com/js/library.js"></script>` ❌ disallowed
 - CSP can also disable inline scripts in the document and JavaScript **eval**.
 - These features can be re-enabled with additional directives.
 - Content-Security-Policy: script-src 'unsafe-inline'
 - Content-Security-Policy: script-src 'unsafe-eval'
- There are lots of other directives that are out of scope

CSP script-src directive

- Content-Security-Policy: script-src <source>;

source ::= <host-source>

| <scheme-source>

| 'self'

| 'unsafe-inline'

| 'unsafe-eval'

| 'none'

| 'nonce-<base64-value>'

| '<hash-algorithm>-<base64-value>'

| 'strict-dynamic'

| 'report-sample'

Weighing JavaScript and WebAssembly threats

- JavaScript **eval** has ambient authority
 - Code in (a sloppy) **eval** has access to the evaluator's *scope*
 - A JS scope inevitability includes sensitive operations, representing a risk
- WebAssembly has capability-based security
 - Code in a module can only access that which is supplied at *instantiation* time of module
 - No risk that code can access *more* capabilities
 - But, man-in-the-middle type attacks can still substitute *different* code

The distinction is worth mentioning, yet CSP restrictions are still useful

What does CSP for Wasm accomplish?

- Prevent man-in-the-middle attacks (resource integrity)
- Prevent JavaScript vulnerabilities from becoming WASM vulnerabilities
 - The route is a bit more indirect.
 - E.g. JavaScript-generated URL \Rightarrow fetch WASM module
 - JavaScript imports object \Rightarrow WASM module
- To achieve its intended purpose, CSP is needed for *both* JavaScript and WASM on a page.

CSP “safe” WebAssembly operations

- Many uncontroversial operations need no CSP consideration.

| Operation | ✗ unsafe-eval | ✓ unsafe-eval |
|---|---------------|---------------|
| <code>new WebAssembly.CompileError()</code> | ✓ | ✓ |
| <code>new WebAssembly.LinkError()</code> | ✓ | ✓ |
| <code>new WebAssembly.Table()</code> | ✓ | ✓ |
| <code>new WebAssembly.Global()</code> | ✓ | ✓ |
| <code>new WebAssembly.Memory()</code> | ✓ | ✓ |

CSP “safe” WebAssembly operations

- There has been some discussion about instantiation.
I argue it is “safe” when it *does not create* new code and propose to allow it.

| Operation | ✗ unsafe-eval | ✓ unsafe-eval |
|---|---------------|---------------|
| <code>new WebAssembly.Instance(module)</code> | ✓ | ✓ |
| <code>WebAssembly.instantiate(module)</code> | ✓ | ✓ |

CSP proposal addition (1) - wasm-eval

- Introduce a new `script-src` directive: `wasm-eval`
 - allows **new** `WebAssembly.Module()` and friends *but* no JavaScript `eval`
- Already implemented in Chromium for extension URLs (ChromeOS)
- Big hammer: effectively enables all WASM

| Operation | ✗ unsafe-eval | ✓ wasm-eval | ✓ unsafe-eval |
|---------------------------------------|---------------|-------------|---------------|
| JavaScript <code>eval()</code> | ✗ | ✗ | ✓ |
| <code>new WebAssembly.Module()</code> | ✗ | ✓ | ✓ |
| <code>WebAssembly.compile()</code> | ✗ | ✓ | ✓ |
| <code>WebAssembly.validate()</code> | ✗ | ✓ | ✓ |

CSP proposal addition (2) - streaming operations

- WebAssembly streaming APIs accept **Response** objects
- Proposal: implementation **Response** has internal URL
- URL checked against CSP policy in streaming operations

| Operation | ✗ unsafe-eval | ✓ wasm-eval | ✓ unsafe-eval |
|------------------------------------|---------------|-------------|---------------|
| WebAssembly.compileStreaming() | CSP | CSP | CSP |
| WebAssembly.instantiateStreaming() | CSP | CSP | CSP |

- CSP checks: script origins and sub-resource integrity (e.g. hash)
- Enforce required mimetype: **application/wasm**

Open Issues

- #3 - Do we need to check the mimetype for streaming?
- #4 - Does `Response` really need a URL?
- #8 - Allow sub-resource integrity matching for compile APIs
- #9 - Do `WebAssembly.Module` objects need origin info?

#8 Allow compile-with-bytes if hash matches

- Allow compile APIs to work if bytes match a SRI hash?
 - Content-Security-Policy: script-src 'sha256-123...456'

| Operation | ✗ unsafe-eval | ✓ wasm-eval | ✓ unsafe-eval |
|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|---------------|
| JavaScript eval() | ✗ | ✗ | ✓ |
| new WebAssembly.Module() | SRI | SRI | ✓ |
| WebAssembly.compile() | SRI | SRI | ✓ |
| WebAssembly.validate() | SRI | SRI | ✓ |

#3 Do Mime Types need to match?

- Current proposal text suggestions that streaming APIs check mimetype
- Do we want that?
- That enforcement would be (yet another) addition to Response

#9 Should WebAssembly.Module objects have origin info?

- Objects in the Web platform do not, as a rule, contain origins
 - `postMessage()` on an object does not currently imply access permission checks
 - Cannot `postMessage()` a module to another worker that is not same origin
 - \Rightarrow `postMessage()` does not need permission checks here
(and it would be weird if it did)
 - Workers that can post-message a WASM module share the same script sources
 - *Except* proposed CSP feature for more restrictive policies in workers
- Backroom discussion
 - CSP policy applies to an entire document
 - Not possible to have different CSP policies for shared workers, unless...
 - Browser honors *more restrictive* CSP policy for the script used to start a worker
 - This is currently being discussed by CSP groups; Google would prefer not
 \Rightarrow CSP policy for entire document is sufficient

WebAssembly CSP moving pieces

- CSP proposal (GitHub [repo](#))
 - Overview
 - Issues being discussed
- Specifications
 - JavaScript API specification: hooks for web platform to disallow certain APIs
 - Web Embedding specification: CSP semantics
 - CSP specification: new `wasm-eval` directive
 - WebIDL specification (whatwg/fetch?): Response URL