#### ADJOINING DECLASSIFICATION AND ATTACK MODELS BY ABSTRACT INTERPRETATION

#### Roberto Giacobazzi and Isabella Mastroeni

Dipartimento di Informatica

Università di Verona

Italy

Edimburgh, April 8th, 2005

# **The Problem: Non-Interference**



## **The Problem: Non-Interference**



## **The Problem: Non-Interference**



SECURITY PROPERTY: States which classes have not to interfere with other classes of objects.

SECURITY PROPERTY: States which classes have not to interfere with other classes of objects.

Confi nement problem[Lampson'73]: Preventing the results of computations leaking even partial information about the confidential inputs.

SECURITY PROPERTY: States which classes have not to interfere with other classes of objects.

Confi nement problem[Lampson'73]: Preventing the results of computations leaking even partial information about the confidential inputs.

Non-interference policies require that any change upon confidential data has not to be revealed through the observation of public data.

- 6 Many real systems are intended to leak some kind of information
- Seven if a system satisfi es non-interference, some kind of tests could reject it as insecure

SECURITY PROPERTY: States which classes have not to interfere with other classes of objects.

Confi nement problem[Lampson'73]: Preventing the results of computations leaking even partial information about the confidential inputs.

Non-interference policies require that any change upon confidential data has not to be revealed through the observation of public data.

- Characterizing released information: [Cohen'77], [Zdancewic & Myers'01], [Clark et al.'04], [Lowe'02];
- 6 Constraining attackers: [Di Pierro et al.'02], [Laud'01].

# **Our idea: Abstracting Non-Interference**



# **Our idea: Abstracting Non-Interference**



# **Our idea: Abstracting Non-Interference**



#### Abstract domain completeness

Let  $< A, \alpha, \gamma, C > a$  Galois insertion. [Cousot & Cousot '77,'79] f : C  $\longrightarrow C$ , f<sup>a</sup> =  $\alpha \circ f \circ \gamma : A \longrightarrow A$  (b.c.a. of f) and  $\rho = \gamma \circ \alpha$ 



#### Abstract domain completeness

Let  $< A, \alpha, \gamma, C > a$  Galois insertion. [Cousot & Cousot '77,'79] f : C  $\longrightarrow C$ , f<sup>a</sup> =  $\alpha \circ f \circ \gamma : A \longrightarrow A$  (b.c.a. of f) and  $\rho = \gamma \circ \alpha$ 





























Adjoining Declassification and Attack Models by Abstract Interpretation - p.8/19



Adjoining Declassification and Attack Models by Abstract Interpretation – p.8/19



Adjoining Declassification and Attack Models by Abstract Interpretation – p.8/19









Adjoining Declassification and Attack Models by Abstract Interpretation - p.9/19





Adjoining Declassification and Attack Models by Abstract Interpretation - p.9/19



Adjoining Declassification and Attack Models by Abstract Interpretation – p.9/19



EXAMPLE I:

while h do 
$$(l := l + 2; h := h - 1)$$
.

Standard Non-Interference  $\equiv [id]P(id)$ 

$$h = 0, \ l = 1 \implies l = 1$$
$$h = 1, \ l = 1 \implies l = 3$$
$$h = n, \ l = 1 \implies l = 1 + 2n$$

EXAMPLE I:

while h do 
$$(l := l + 2; h := h - 1)$$
.

Standard Non-Interference  $\equiv [id]P(id)$ 

$$h = 0, \ l = 1 \implies l = 1$$
$$h = 1, \ l = 1 \implies l = 3$$
$$h = n, \ l = 1 \implies l = 1 + 2n$$

$$\begin{split} h &= 0, \ l = 1 \ \rightsquigarrow \ \textit{Par}(l) = \textit{odd} \\ h &= 1, \ l = 1 \ \rightsquigarrow \ \textit{Par}(l) = \textit{odd} \\ h &= n, \ l = 1 \ \rightsquigarrow \ \textit{Par}(l) = \textit{odd} \end{split}$$

#### EXAMPLE II:

$$\mathsf{P} = \mathsf{l} := 2 * \mathsf{l} * \mathsf{h}^2.$$

[Par]P(Sign)

$$\begin{split} h &= 1, \ l = 4 \ (\textit{Par}(4) = \textit{even}) \ \rightsquigarrow \ \textit{Sign}(l) = + \\ h &= 1, \ l = -4 \ (\textit{Par}(-4) = \textit{even}) \ \rightsquigarrow \ \textit{Sign}(l) = - \end{split}$$

#### EXAMPLE II:

$$\mathsf{P} = \mathsf{l} := 2 * \mathsf{l} * \mathsf{h}^2.$$

$$\begin{split} h &= 1, \ l = 4 \ (\textit{Par}(4) = \textit{even}) \ \rightsquigarrow \ \textit{Sign}(l) = + \\ h &= 1, \ l = -4 \ (\textit{Par}(-4) = \textit{even}) \ \rightsquigarrow \ \textit{Sign}(l) = - \end{split}$$

h = -3,  $Par(l) = even \rightsquigarrow Sign(l) = I don't know$ h = 1,  $Par(l) = even \rightsquigarrow Sign(l) = I don't know$ 

#### EXAMPLE III:

$$P = l := l * h^2.$$

$$(\textit{id})P(\textit{Par})$$

$$h = 2, \ l = 1 \implies Par(l) = even$$
$$h = 3, \ l = 1 \implies Par(l) = odd$$
$$h = n, \ l = 1 \implies Par(l) = Par(n)$$

#### EXAMPLE III:

$$\mathsf{P} = \mathsf{l} := \mathsf{l} * \mathsf{h}^2.$$

$$\begin{split} h &= 2, \ l = 1 \ \rightsquigarrow \ \textit{Par}(l) = \text{even} \\ h &= 3, \ l = 1 \ \rightsquigarrow \ \textit{Par}(l) = \text{odd} \\ h &= n, \ l = 1 \ \rightsquigarrow \ \textit{Par}(l) = \textit{Par}(n) \end{split}$$

$$\downarrow$$

$$(\mathit{id}) P(\mathit{Sign} \leadsto Par)$$

 $\begin{aligned} & \textit{Sign}(h) = +, \ l = 1 \ \rightsquigarrow \ \textit{Par}(l) = \textit{I} \ \textit{don't} \ \textit{know} \\ & \textit{Sign}(h) = -, \ l = 1 \ \rightsquigarrow \ \textit{Par}(l) = \textit{I} \ \textit{don't} \ \textit{know} \end{aligned}$ 

# T

# **Deriving output attackers**

Abstract interpretation provides advanced methods for designing abstractions (refi nement, simplifi cation, compression ...)

Designing abstractions = designing attackers

# T

# **Deriving output attackers**

Abstract interpretation provides advanced methods for designing abstractions (refi nement, simplifi cation, compression ...)

Designing abstractions = designing attackers

6 Characterize the most concrete  $\rho$  such that  $(\eta)P(\phi \rightsquigarrow \rho)$ [The most powerful *public observer*]

# **Deriving canonical attackers**

Abstract interpretation provides advanced methods for designing abstractions (refi nement, simplifi cation, compression ...)

Transforming abstractions = transforming attackers

# **Deriving canonical attackers**

Abstract interpretation provides advanced methods for designing abstractions (refi nement, simplifi cation, compression ...)

Transforming abstractions = transforming attackers

G Characterize the most concrete δ such that  $(\delta) P(\phi \sim \delta)$ [The most powerful *canonical* public observer]

 $\Rightarrow$  This would provide a certifi cate for security.

# T



Consider a program P and its fi nite computations.

A passive attacker may be able to learn some information by observing the system but, by assumption, that information leakage is allowed by the security policy. [Zdancewic and Myers 2001]



Consider a program P and its finite computations.

A passive attacker may be able to learn some information by observing the system but, by assumption, that information leakage is allowed by the security policy. [Zdancewic and Myers 2001]

6 We want to characterize the most abstract *private observable* property such that  $(\eta)P(\phi \Rightarrow \rho)$ 

[The maximal amount of information disclosed]

 $\Rightarrow$  This would provide a certifi cate for disclosed secrets.

#### **Observer vs Observable**

Consider  $\models (\eta) P(\phi \rightsquigarrow \rho)$ : In order to keep non-interference...

#### **Observer vs Observable**

Consider  $\models (\eta) P(\phi \rightsquigarrow \rho)$ : In order to keep non-interference...



### **Observer vs Observable**

Consider  $\models (\eta) P(\phi \rightsquigarrow \rho)$ : In order to keep non-interference...



Recall that [Joshi & Leino'00]

P is secure iff HH; P;  $HH \doteq P$ ; HH

Recall that [Joshi & Leino'00]

P is secure iff HH; P;  $HH \doteq P$ ; HH

Let 
$$X = \langle X^{H}, X^{L} \rangle \Rightarrow \mathcal{H}(X) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \langle T^{H}, X^{L} \rangle \in uco(\wp(\mathbb{V}))$$
  
 $H H ; P; H H \doteq P ; H H$   
 $\downarrow \downarrow$   
 $\mathcal{H} \circ \llbracket P \rrbracket \circ \mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H} \circ \llbracket P \rrbracket$ 

Recall that [Joshi & Leino'00]

P is secure iff HH; P;  $HH \doteq P$ ; HH

Let 
$$X = \langle X^{H}, X^{L} \rangle \Rightarrow \mathcal{H}(X) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \langle T^{H}, X^{L} \rangle \in uco(\wp(\mathbb{V}))$$
  
 $H H ; P; H H \doteq P ; H H$   
 $\downarrow \downarrow$   
 $\mathcal{H} \circ \llbracket P \rrbracket \circ \mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H} \circ \llbracket P \rrbracket$ 

 $\Rightarrow$  A completeness problem

Let 
$$X = \langle X^{H}, X^{L} \rangle \Rightarrow \mathcal{H}(X) \stackrel{\mathsf{def}}{=} \langle T^{H}, X^{L} \rangle \in \mathit{uco}(\wp(\mathbb{V}))$$
  
 $\mathcal{H} \circ \llbracket P \rrbracket \circ \mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H} \circ \llbracket P \rrbracket$ 

COMPLETENESS = NON-INTERFERENCE



**6** Transform  $\mathcal{H}$  vs **Shell**.

[Giacobazzi et al.'00]

[Giacobazzi et al.'00]



$$R_{f} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lambda \rho. \mathcal{M}(\bigcup_{y \in \rho} \max(f^{-1}(\downarrow y)))$$

[Giacobazzi et al.'00]



$$R_{f} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lambda \rho. \mathcal{M}(\bigcup_{y \in \rho} \max(f^{-1}(\downarrow y)))$$

- 6 Absolute shell of  $\rho$ :  $\mathcal{R}_{f}(\rho) = gfp\overline{\overline{\rho}}\lambda\phi.\rho \sqcap R_{f}^{\mathcal{B}}(\phi);$
- 6 *Relative shell* of  $\eta$  relative to  $\rho$ :  $\mathcal{R}_{f}^{\rho}(\eta) = \eta \sqcap R_{f}(\rho)$ .





$$C_{f} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lambda \rho. \left\{ y \in C \mid \max(f^{-1}(\downarrow y)) \subseteq \rho \right\}$$





$$C_{f} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lambda \rho. \left\{ y \in C \mid \max(f^{-1}(\downarrow y)) \subseteq \rho \right\}$$

- 6 Absolute core of  $\rho$ :  $C_f(\rho) = lf \rho \overline{\rho} \lambda \phi . \rho \sqcup C_f^{\mathcal{B}}(\phi);$
- 6 Relative core of  $\rho$  relative to  $\eta$ :  $C_{f}^{\eta}(\rho) = \rho \sqcup C_{f}(\eta)$ .

Let  $\rho \in \textit{uco}(\wp(\mathbb{V}^{L})) \Rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{\rho}(X) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \langle \top^{H}, \rho(X^{L}) \rangle \in \textit{uco}(\wp(\mathbb{V}))$ 

- 6 Narrow abstract non-interference:  $\mathcal{H}_{\rho} \circ \llbracket P \rrbracket \circ \mathcal{H}_{\eta} = \mathcal{H}_{\rho} \circ \llbracket P \rrbracket$ ;
- 6 Abstract non-interference:  $\mathcal{H}_{\rho} \circ \llbracket P \rrbracket^{\eta, \phi} \circ \mathcal{H}_{\eta} = \mathcal{H}_{\rho} \circ \llbracket P \rrbracket^{\eta, \phi}$

Let  $\rho \in \textit{uco}(\wp(\mathbb{V}^{L})) \Rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{\rho}(X) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \langle \top^{H}, \rho(X^{L}) \rangle \in \textit{uco}(\wp(\mathbb{V}))$ 

- 6 Narrow abstract non-interference:  $\mathcal{H}_{\rho} \circ \llbracket P \rrbracket \circ \mathcal{H}_{\eta} = \mathcal{H}_{\rho} \circ \llbracket P \rrbracket$ ;
- 6 Abstract non-interference:  $\mathcal{H}_{\rho} \circ [\![P]\!]^{\eta, \varphi} \circ \mathcal{H}_{\eta} = \mathcal{H}_{\rho} \circ [\![P]\!]^{\eta, \varphi}$

6 Public observer as completeness core:  $C_{\llbracket P \rrbracket^{\eta, \phi}}^{\mathcal{H}_{\eta}}(\mathcal{H}) = (\eta) \llbracket P \rrbracket(\phi \rightsquigarrow id)$ 

Let 
$$\rho \in \textit{uco}(\wp(\mathbb{V}^{L})) \Rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{\rho}(X) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \langle \top^{H}, \rho(X^{L}) \rangle \in \textit{uco}(\wp(\mathbb{V}))$$

- 6 Narrow abstract non-interference:  $\mathcal{H}_{\rho} \circ \llbracket P \rrbracket \circ \mathcal{H}_{\eta} = \mathcal{H}_{\rho} \circ \llbracket P \rrbracket$ ;
- 6 Abstract non-interference:  $\mathcal{H}_{\rho} \circ \llbracket P \rrbracket^{\eta, \phi} \circ \mathcal{H}_{\eta} = \mathcal{H}_{\rho} \circ \llbracket P \rrbracket^{\eta, \phi}$

G PUBLIC OBSERVER AS COMPLETENESS CORE:  $\mathcal{C}_{\llbracket P \rrbracket^{\eta}, \Phi}^{\mathcal{H}_{\eta}}(\mathcal{H}) = (\eta) \llbracket P \rrbracket(\phi \rightsquigarrow Id)$ G PRIVATE OBSERVABLE AS COMPLETENESS SHELL:  $(\eta) P(\mathcal{R}_{\llbracket P \rrbracket^{\eta}, id}^{\mathcal{H}_{\rho}}(\mathcal{H}_{\eta}) \Rightarrow \rho)$ 

- 6 PUBLIC OBSERVER AS COMPLETENESS CORE:  $C_{\mathbb{P}}^{\mathcal{H}_{\eta}}(\mathcal{H}) = (\eta) [\![P]\!] (\phi \sim \mathcal{H} id)$
- **6** PRIVATE OBSERVABLE AS COMPLETENESS SHELL:  $(\eta) P(\mathcal{R}^{\mathcal{H}_{\rho}}_{[\![P]\!]\eta, id}(\mathcal{H}_{\eta}) \Rightarrow \rho)$
- 6 ADJOINING ATTACKERS AND DECLASSIFICATION

 $\textit{id} \sqsubset (\eta) \llbracket P \rrbracket (\textit{id} \leadsto \textit{id}) \iff \mathcal{P}(\sqcap_{L \in \eta} \mathcal{M}(\Pi_{P} (\eta, \textit{id})_{|L})) \sqsubset \top$ 



#### **Abstract Non–Interference**

#### Certification of secrecy degree of programs

Most concrete

public observer

Most abstract private observable









# A discussion: Future works



# A discussion: Future works



# A discussion: Future works

