Exercise: Information Flow Control

Software Security

Steffen Helke

Chair of Software Engineering

26th November 2018



Objectives of today's lecture

- → Repetition: How to make *Bell-LaPadula model* more flexible? How to express security policies in JiF?
- → Understanding and applying analytical techniques to detect undesirable information flows in a program code of JiF
- → Being able to implement security policies for small code examples based on JiF (Java + Information Flow)

Repetition: Bell-LaPadula Model (BLP)

Repetition: Bell-LaPadula Model (BLP)

1. How to make BLP more flexible?

- → The security class of an object/subject can be change during life time under certain rules (high watermark principle)
- → Example: A process starts with low security class and is upgraded when accessing objects of a higher security class, iff the new class is not greater than the watermark

2. How to bypass BLP with the help of covered channels?

- → Storage Channels:
 - Process of high security class transmits confidential information by actions with the hard disk drive, e.g. using the read head
 - Process of low security class is able to monitor these actions
- → Timing Channels:
 - Data transmission by measuring the runtime of processes

JIF: Java + Information Flow

JIF: Java + **Information Flow**

General Remarks

- Development 1997 at the Cornell University
- Security-typed programming language that extends Java
- Based on a Decentralized Label Model (DLM)



Language Features

- Labels for *Integrity & Confidentiality*
- Policy specification using *Principals*
- Hierarchical relationships between principals can be specified (acts-for relation)
- Declassification of labeled objects with respect to confidentiality & integrity is supported.

JIF-Homepage: http://www.cs.cornell.edu/jif/

Decentralized Model of Security Labels

Confidentiality Rules

- Notation: $u \rightarrow p$
- Owner u trusts the reader p not to give the information to unauthorized persons

Integrity Rules

- Notation: $u \leftarrow p$
- Owner *u* trusts the writer *p* not to destroy or damage the information

```
// only Alice and Bob are allowed to read a
int{Alice -> Bob} a;

// only Alice is allowed to write b
int{Alice <- Alice} b;

// combined read and write permissions
int{Alice -> Bob; Alice <- Alice} c;</pre>
```

Example for Confidentiality

```
// only Alice and Bob are allowed to read a
int{Alice -> Bob} a;

// only Alice is allowed to read b
int{Alice -> Alice} b;

a = b;
b = a;
```

Example for Confidentiality

```
// only Alice and Bob are allowed to read a
int{Alice → Bob} a;

// only Alice is allowed to read b
int{Alice → Alice} b;

a = b; // not allowed!
b = a; // allowed, because readers(b) ⊆ readers(a)
```

Example for Integrity

```
// only Alice and Bob are allowed to write a
int{Alice <- Bob} a;

// only Alice is allowed to write b
int{Alice <- Alice} b;

a = b;
b = a;</pre>
```

Example for Integrity

```
// only Alice and Bob are allowed to write a
int{Alice <- Bob} a;

// only Alice is allowed to write b
int{Alice <- Alice} b;

a = b; // allowed, because writers(b) ⊆ writers(a)
b = a; // not allowed!</pre>
```

JiF Exercises

1 My first JiF Program

Objective

→ Get a first impression of how to handle security labels in JiF

Tasks

- → Generate two principals *Alice* and *Bob*
- → Declare integer variables and define assignments using these variables
- → Apply confidentiality and integrity policies separately and together
- → Define a label for a variable in such a way that the value can be assigned by any other variable

Generalization: Assignments

What does the JIF compiler check for the assignment

- → Main target: sc(b) is less restricted than sc(a)i.e. $sc(b) \sqsubseteq sc(a) := sc(b) \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{C}} sc(a) \land sc(b) \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{I}} sc(a)$
- → Consists of the following subgoals:
 - 1 b has a greater or equal number of readers than a $sc(b) \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{C}} sc(a) := readers(b) \supseteq readers(a)$,
 - 2 b has a lower or equal number of writers than a $sc(b) \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{I}} sc(a) := writers(b) \subseteq writers(a)$
- → This results in the following partial order relation with a bottom and top element {- -> -; * <- *} </p>
 □ ...
 □ {* -> *; <- -}</p>

Note: The JIF-operator * represents no principals and the JIF-operator represents all principals, sc(x) is the security label of the variable x

How to deal with implicit information flows?

- Analysis of implicit information flows is implemented using a pc label (program-counter label)
- What is a suitable security label for the variable *b*?

```
class Test {
  int {Bob -> Alice, Bob} a = 0;
  int { ... } b;

  public void f {} () {
    if (a == 0) {
       b = 4; // check the pc label
    }
  }
}
```

Implicit information flows and method calls

Question: What is problematic with a method call?

```
class Test {
  int {Bob -> Alice, Bob, Steffen} a = 0;
  int {Bob -> Bob} b;

public void f {} () {
  if (a == 0)
     setB();
  }
 private void setB () {
  b = 4;
}}
```

→ Value assignment in the method setB() must be checked for all possible contexts in which this method is potentially called

Implicit information flows and method calls

- Implicit information flows for method calls are handled in JIF by so-called begin labels
- A *begin label* defines the *upper bound* for all pc labels at which the method can be called

```
class Test {
   int {Bob -> Alice, Bob, Steffen} a = 0;
   int {Bob -> Bob} b;

   public void f {} () {
      if (a == 0)
        setB();
   }
   private void setB { ... } () {
      b = 4;
}
```

→ What is a suitable begin label for the method setB?

JiF Exercises

2 Task: Refactoring Extract Method

Objective

→ Getting familiar with begin labels of methods

Tasks

- → Consider for the information flow only the start labels of the methods
- → Generate the begin labels in two different ways: First in the most restrictive variant and then in the most general one, such that in the latter case the method could be called in other contexts too

2 Task: Refactoring Extract Method

- In the following program, redundant code is to be extracted into an independent method → Refactoring Extract Method
- Which signature (*begin label*) should be used to ensure that the security policy is preserved after restructuring?

```
class Refactoring {
   int {Bob -> Alice, Bob, Steffen} a = 0;
  int \{Bob \rightarrow Bob\} b = 1;
  int {Bob -> Alice, Bob} c;
   public void f \{\} () \{
   if (a = 0)
       b = 4:
       c = 3:
  c = 3:
   }}}
```