

Sample Examination Questions for MPRI 2-30

(All documents are allowed; duration: 3h)

February 20, 2024

1 Non-Interference

We consider the label lattice $\{L, H\}$ with $L \leq H$. For each of the following program, indicate whether it satisfies non-interference by either building a typing derivation using the rules in Appendix A or showing where typing fails. Additionally, explain whether the program satisfies the constant-time programming discipline.

1. $x : H \text{ var}, y : H \text{ var} \vdash \text{if } x = 1 \text{ then } y := 1 \text{ else } y := 0$
2. $x : H \text{ var}, y : L \text{ var} \vdash \text{if } x = 5 \text{ then } x := 3 \text{ else } y := 0$
3. $x : H \text{ var}, y : L \text{ var} \vdash \text{while } x < 10 \text{ do } (\text{if } y = 2 \text{ then } x := x + 1 \text{ else } x := x + 2)$
4. $x : L \text{ var}, y : H \text{ var} \vdash \text{while } x < 10 \text{ do } (x := x + 1; y := y + 1)$

For each of the following programs, explain whether it satisfies speculative constant-time, or why it might be susceptible to speculative side-channel attacks. You can use the rules in Appendix B to justify your answer, however, building complete typing derivations is not required. All variables except s and sec will be considered as public, and we assume that the mask ms is well-initialized.

1.

```
if i < 5 {  
  s[i] = sec;  
}  
x = p[0];  
w[x] = 0;
```
2.

```
if i < 10 {  
  ms = set_ms(i < 10);  
  x = p[i];  
  x = protect(x, ms);  
}  
w[x] = 0;
```

2 Label-based Verification

Question 1. Consider the following signature for (asymmetric) encryption

```
val enc (l1 l2: label) (msg: bytes l1) (k: pub_key l2) : bytes Public
```

What relation do we need on labels l_1 and l_2 to model a "secure" encryption?

Question 2. In your own words, explain the labels in the (simplified) signature of Diffie-Hellman shown below

```
val dh (l1: label) (priv: dh_private_key l1) (l2: label) (pub: dh_public_key l2) :  
    dh_result (join l1 l2)
```

Question 3. Consider the following code, implementing the Noise message $\rightarrow es, ss$, modeling a mix of Alice's ephemeral key and Bob's static key, followed by a mix of Alice's and Bob's static keys.

```
let ck0: chaining_key public = init in  
// es  
let dh_es = dh e rs in  
let ck1 = kdf ck0 dh_es in  
// ss  
let dh_ss = dh s rs in  
let ck2 = kdf ck1 dh_ss
```

We consider two types of security labels:

- data with label [P "Alice"] corresponds to static data that can only be read by principal "Alice"
- data with label [S "Bob" sid] corresponds to ephemeral data that can only be read by principal "Bob" at session sid

Assuming we are currently at session sn , and using the signature for kdf below, give the types, including labels, associated to dh_es , dh_ss , $ck1$, and $ck2$.

```
val kdf (l1 l2: label) (k: chaining_key l1) (dh: dh_result l2) : chaining_key (meet l1 l2)
```

3 Stateful Verification

Question 1. Consider the following F* code, implementing a stateful sum:

```
let sum_tot (n:nat) = ((n+1) * n) / 2  
  
let rec sum_st' (r:ref nat) (n:nat)  
    : ST unit (requires ( $\lambda \_ \rightarrow \top$ )) (ensures ( $\lambda \_ \_ \rightarrow \top$ ))  
    = if n > 0 then (r := !r + n; sum_st' r (n - 1))  
  
let rec sum_st (n:nat)
```

```

: ST nat (requires ( $\lambda \_ \rightarrow \top$ ))
  (ensures ( $\lambda h0 \ x \ h1 \rightarrow x == \text{sum\_tot } n \wedge \text{modifies } \{\} \ h0 \ h1$ ))
= let r = alloc 0 in
  sum_st' r n;
  !r

```

Extend the signature of the intermediate function `sum_st'` so that `sum_st` typechecks.

Question 2. Consider the following F^{*} code:

```

let incr (r: ref int) : ST unit (requires ( $\lambda \_ \rightarrow \top$ ))
  (ensures  $\lambda h0 \ \_ \ h1 \rightarrow \text{modifies } \{r\} \ h0 \ h1 \wedge \text{sel } h1 \ r == \text{sel } h0 \ r + 1$ )
  = r := !r + 1

let f (r1 r2: ref int) : ST unit (requires  $\lambda \_ \rightarrow \top$ )
  (ensures  $\lambda h0 \ \_ \ h1 \rightarrow \text{modifies } \{r1, r2\} \ h0 \ h1 \wedge$ 
     $\text{sel } h1 \ r1 == \text{sel } h0 \ r1 + 2 \wedge \text{sel } h1 \ r2 == \text{sel } h0 \ r2 + 1$ )
  = incr r1; incr r2; incr r1

```

Assuming that the implementation of `incr` satisfies its specification, provide a detailed proof of the correctness of `f`, indicating the known logical facts in each intermediate state (after the first, second and third function calls)

A Typing Rules for Information-Flow Control

INT $\gamma \vdash n : \tau$	VAR $\frac{\gamma(x) = \tau \text{ var}}{\gamma \vdash x : \tau \text{ var}}$	ARITH $\frac{\gamma \vdash e : \tau \quad \gamma \vdash e' : \tau}{\gamma \vdash e + e' : \tau}$
ASSIGN $\frac{\gamma \vdash e : \tau \text{ var} \quad \gamma \vdash e' : \tau}{\gamma \vdash e := e' : \tau \text{ cmd}}$	COMPOSE $\frac{\gamma \vdash c : \tau \text{ cmd} \quad \gamma \vdash c' : \tau \text{ cmd}}{\gamma \vdash c; c' : \tau \text{ cmd}}$	
R-VAL $\frac{\gamma \vdash e : \tau \text{ var}}{\gamma \vdash e : \tau}$	IF $\frac{\gamma \vdash e : \tau \quad \gamma \vdash c : \tau \text{ cmd} \quad \gamma \vdash c' : \tau \text{ cmd}}{\gamma \vdash \text{if } e \text{ then } c \text{ else } c' : \tau \text{ cmd}}$	
	WHILE $\frac{\gamma \vdash e : \tau \quad \gamma \vdash c : \tau \text{ cmd}}{\gamma \vdash \text{while } e \text{ do } c : \tau \text{ cmd}}$	BASE $\frac{\tau \leq \tau'}{\vdash \tau \subseteq \tau'}$
SUBTYPE $\frac{\gamma \vdash p : \rho \quad \vdash \rho \subseteq \rho'}{\gamma \vdash p : \rho'}$	CMD- $\frac{\vdash \tau \subseteq \tau'}{\vdash \tau' \text{ cmd} \subseteq \tau \text{ cmd}}$	

B Typing Rules for Speculative Constant-Time

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{VAR} \\
\frac{}{\Gamma \vdash x : \Gamma(x)} \\
\\
\text{OP} \\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash e_1 : \tau_1 \quad \Gamma \vdash e_2 : \tau_2}{\Gamma \vdash \text{op}(e_1, e_2) : \tau_1 \cup \tau_2} \\
\\
\text{CONST} \\
\frac{}{\Gamma \vdash n : (L, L)} \\
\\
\text{SUB} \\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash e : \tau \quad \tau \leq \tau'}{\Gamma \vdash e : \tau'} \\
\\
\text{IF} \\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash b : (L, L) \quad \Sigma|_b, \Gamma \vdash c_1 : \Sigma_1, \Gamma_1 \quad \Sigma|_{!b}, \Gamma \vdash c_2 : \Sigma_2, \Gamma_2}{\Sigma, \Gamma \vdash \text{if } b \text{ then } c_1 \text{ else } c_2, \Sigma_1 \cap \Sigma_2, \Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2} \\
\\
\text{LOAD} \\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash i : (L, L) \quad \Gamma(a) = (\tau_n, \tau_s)}{\Gamma \vdash x = a[i] : \Gamma[x \leftarrow (\tau_n, H)]} \quad \text{LOAD} \\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash i : (L, L) \quad \Gamma(a) = (\tau_n, \tau_s)}{\Sigma, \Gamma \vdash x = a[i] : \Sigma, \Gamma[x \leftarrow (\tau_n, H)]} \\
\\
\text{CONST-LOAD} \\
\frac{\text{n is constant}}{\Sigma, \Gamma \vdash x = a[n] : \Sigma, \Gamma[x \leftarrow \Gamma(a)]} \\
\\
\text{STORE} \\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash i : (L, L) \quad \Gamma \vdash e : \tau \quad \tau \leq \Gamma(a) \quad \forall a' : \mathbf{A}, a' \neq a. \Gamma'[a'] = (\Gamma_n[a'], \tau_s \cup \Gamma_s[a'])}{\Sigma, \Gamma \vdash a[i] = e : \Sigma, \Gamma'} \\
\\
\text{SEQ} \\
\frac{\Sigma_0, \Gamma_0 \vdash c_1 : \Sigma_1, \Gamma_1 \quad \Sigma_1, \Gamma_1 \vdash c_2 : \Sigma_2, \Gamma_2}{\Sigma_0, \Gamma_0 \vdash c_1; c_2 : \Sigma_2, \Gamma_2} \quad \text{ASSIGN} \\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash e : \tau}{\Sigma, \Gamma \vdash x = e : \Sigma, \Gamma[x \leftarrow \tau]} \\
\\
\text{SET-MS} \\
\text{ms}_{|e}, \Gamma \vdash \text{ms} = \text{set_ms}(e) : \text{ms}, \Gamma \quad \text{PROTECT} \\
\frac{\Gamma' = \Gamma[y \leftarrow (\Gamma_n(x), \Gamma_n(x))]}{\text{ms}, \Gamma \vdash y = \text{protect}(x, \text{ms}) : \text{ms}, \Gamma'}
\end{array}$$