Disjunction Category Labels

Deian Stefan, Alejandro Russo, David Mazières, John Mitchell



CHALMERS

NordSec 2011



- Bob does not trust WebTax
 WebTax can exfiltrated his data
- WebTax author does not trust Bob
 Bob can learn proprietary information by inspecting code
- WebTax author want to prevent leaks due to bugs



- Bob does not trust WebTax
 WebTax can exfiltrated his data
- WebTax author does not trust Bob
 Bob can learn proprietary information by inspecting code
- WebTax author want to prevent leaks due to bugs



- Bob does not trust WebTax
 WebTax can exfiltrated his data
- WebTax author does not trust Bob
 Bob can learn proprietary information by inspecting code
- WebTax author want to prevent leaks due to bugs



- Bob does not trust WebTax
 WebTax can exfiltrated his data
- WebTax author does not trust Bob
 Bob can learn proprietary information by inspecting code
- WebTax author want to prevent leaks due to bugs



- Bob does not trust WebTax
 WebTax can exfiltrated his data
- WebTax author does not trust Bob
 Bob can learn proprietary information by inspecting code
- WebTax author want to prevent leaks due to bugs



How do we address security in the presence of mutual-distrust?

Information Flow Control

- Well-established approach to enforcing security
 Confidentiality: prevent unwanted leaks
 Integrity: prevent flows to critical operations
- Decentralized IFC addresses mutual distrust
- Suitable for executing *untrustworthy* code
 Policies specify where data can flow

Example with IFC



IFC Policies

- How are policies specified?
 Associating a label
 with every piece of data
- Labels form a lattice over can-flow-to relation ⊑
 E.g., Bob's data cannot flow to network ⊈ ■
- Policies are enforced at every possible flow



IFC Policies

- How are policies specified?
 Associating a label
 with every piece of data
- Labels form a lattice over can-flow-to relation \Box
 - ► E.g., Bob's data cannot flow to network $\blacksquare \not\subseteq \blacksquare$
- Policies are enforced at every possible flow



IFC Policies

- How are policies specified?
 Associating a label
 with every piece of data
- Labels form a lattice over can-flow-to relation \Box
 - ► E.g., Bob's data cannot flow to network $\blacksquare \not\subseteq \blacksquare$
- Policies are enforced at every possible flow



Motivation for DC Labels

- Existing DIFC systems use ad-hoc label formats
 DLM, Asbestos / HiStar, DStar, Flume, etc. all present their own label format
- Most labels have *not* been formalized
- Some rely on centralized components
- Need simple, sound, expressive & decentralized label format *DC Labels*

DC Labels

 $\langle S, I \rangle$

- Components *S* and *I* are formulas over *principals*Components impose restrictions on data flow
- Principal is a source of authority (e.g., Bob)
- Restrictions:
 - *S* and *I* are minimal (sorted) formulas in CNF
 Neither *S* nor *I* contain negated terms

DC Labels

 $\langle S, I \rangle$

- Secrecy component *S*:
 - Specifies principals allowed or whose consent is necessary to observe the data
- Integrity component *I*:
 - Specifies principals that created or are allowed to modify the data



Speadsheet

WebTax











 $\langle \{ (Bob \lor Alice) \land User \}, \{Bob \lor Alice\} \rangle$

 $\langle \{(Bob \lor Alice) \land User \}, \{Bob \lor Alice\} \rangle$





General observations

- Secrecy: $\{(A \lor B) \land C \land \cdots\}$
 - ► Disjunction III allows more readers
 - ► Conjunction III more restrictions ... more secret
- Integrity: $\{(A \lor B) \land C \land \cdots\}$
 - ► Disjunction III allows more writers
 - ► Conjunction III more restrictions . trustworthy

Enforcing IFC

Data may flow from one entity to another iff
it accumulates more secrecy restrictions
it losses integrity restrictions

$$\frac{S_2 \Longrightarrow S_1 \quad I_1 \Longrightarrow I_2}{\langle S_1, I_1 \rangle \sqsubseteq \langle S_2, I_2 \rangle}$$

Enforcing IFC

Data may flow from one entity to another iff
it accumulates more secrecy restrictions
it losses integrity restrictions



Enforcing IFC

Data may flow from one entity to another iff
it accumulates more secrecy restrictions
it losses integrity restrictions



 $\langle \{Alice \lor Bob\}, True \rangle \longrightarrow \langle \{Alice \lor Bob \lor Charlie\}, True \rangle$ $\langle \{Alice \lor Bob\}, True \rangle \longrightarrow \langle \{Alice \land Dan\}, True \rangle$ $\langle \{Alice \land Bob\}, True \rangle \longrightarrow \langle \{Alice\}, True \rangle$

 $\langle \{Alice \lor Bob\}, True \rangle \not \rightarrow \langle \{Alice \lor Bob \lor Charlie\}, True \rangle$ $\langle \{Alice \lor Bob\}, True \rangle \rightarrow \langle \{Alice \land Dan\}, True \rangle$ $\langle \{Alice \land Bob\}, True \rangle \rightarrow \langle \{Alice\}, True \rangle$

 $\langle \{Alice \lor Bob\}, True \rangle \not \rightarrow \langle \{Alice \lor Bob \lor Charlie\}, True \rangle$ $\langle \{Alice \lor Bob\}, True \rangle \not \rightarrow \langle \{Alice \land Dan\}, True \rangle$ $\langle \{Alice \land Bob\}, True \rangle \rightarrow \langle \{Alice\}, True \rangle$

 $\langle \{Alice \lor Bob\}, True \rangle \not \rightarrow \langle \{Alice \lor Bob \lor Charlie\}, True \rangle$ $\langle \{Alice \lor Bob\}, True \rangle \not \rightarrow \langle \{Alice \land Dan\}, True \rangle$ $\langle \{Alice \land Bob\}, True \rangle \not \rightarrow \langle \{Alice\}, True \rangle$

Integrity

 $\langle \text{True, } \{\text{Alice} \lor \text{Bob} \} \rangle \longrightarrow \langle \text{True, } \{\text{Alice} \lor \text{Bob} \lor \text{Charlie} \} \rangle$ $\langle \text{True, } \{\text{Alice} \} \rangle \longrightarrow \langle \text{True, } \{\text{Alice} \lor \text{Bob} \} \rangle$ $\langle \text{True, } \{\text{Alice} \} \rangle \longrightarrow \langle \text{True, } \{\text{Alice} \land \text{Bob} \} \rangle$

Integrity

 $\langle \text{True}, \{\text{Alice} \lor \text{Bob} \} \rangle \longrightarrow \langle \text{True}, \{\text{Alice} \lor \text{Bob} \lor \text{Charlie} \} \rangle$ $\langle \text{True}, \{\text{Alice} \} \rangle \longrightarrow \langle \text{True}, \{\text{Alice} \lor \text{Bob} \} \rangle$ $\langle \text{True}, \{\text{Alice} \} \rangle \longrightarrow \langle \text{True}, \{\text{Alice} \land \text{Bob} \} \rangle$

Integrity

 $\langle \text{True}, \{\text{Alice} \lor \text{Bob} \} \rangle \checkmark \langle \text{True}, \{\text{Alice} \lor \text{Bob} \lor \text{Charlie} \} \rangle$ $\langle \text{True}, \{\text{Alice} \} \rangle \checkmark \langle \text{True}, \{\text{Alice} \lor \text{Bob} \} \rangle$ $\langle \text{True}, \{\text{Alice} \} \rangle \rightarrow \langle \text{True}, \{\text{Alice} \land \text{Bob} \} \rangle$

Integrity

 $\langle \text{True}, \{\text{Alice} \lor \text{Bob} \} \rangle \longrightarrow \langle \text{True}, \{\text{Alice} \lor \text{Bob} \lor \text{Charlie} \} \rangle$ $\langle \text{True}, \{\text{Alice} \} \rangle \longrightarrow \langle \text{True}, \{\text{Alice} \lor \text{Bob} \} \rangle$ $\langle \text{True}, \{\text{Alice} \} \rangle \longrightarrow \langle \text{True}, \{\text{Alice} \land \text{Bob} \} \rangle$

Combining differently labeled data
 ioin ⊔

$$\langle S_1, I_1 \rangle \sqcup \langle S_2, I_2 \rangle = \langle S_1 \land S_2, I_1 \lor I_2 \rangle$$

Writing to differently labeled entities → meet ⊓
 Dual of join: (S₁, I₁) ⊓ (S₂, I₂) = (S₁∨S₂, I₁∧I₂)

Combining differently labeled data
 ioin ⊔

Need consent of principals in S_1 and S_2 to observe data $\langle S_1, I_1 \rangle \sqcup \langle S_2, I_2 \rangle = \langle S_1 \land S_2, I_1 \lor I_2 \rangle$

Writing to differently labeled entities → meet ⊓
 Dual of join: (S₁, I₁) ⊓ (S₂, I₂) = (S₁∨S₂, I₁∧I₂)

Combining differently labeled data
 ioin ⊔

Need consent of principals in S_1 and S_2 to observe data $\langle S_1, I_1 \rangle \sqcup \langle S_2, I_2 \rangle = \langle S_1 \land S_2, I_1 \lor I_2 \rangle$

Writing to differently labeled entities ➡ meet □
 Dual of join: (S₁, I₁) □ (S₂, I₂) = (S₁∨S₂, I₁∧I₂)

- DC Labels are partially ordered by ⊑ relation
- Have a well-defined join ⊔
- Have a well-defined meet ⊓
- We define top & bottom elements:
 - $= \langle False, True \rangle$ $\perp = \langle True, False \rangle$









Privileges

- In any practical system need to have method of releasing information
- Mutual-distrustful systems require *declassification* E.g., WebTax needs to declassify data for Bob
- Code running on behalf of principals can exercise *privileges* corresponding to the principals
 Can declassify & endorse data using ⊑_P relation

"can-flow-to given privileges p"

Privileges

• Privileges *P* are conjunctions of principals

$$\frac{P \wedge S_2 \Longrightarrow S_1 \quad P \wedge I_1 \Longrightarrow I_2}{\langle S_1, I_1 \rangle \sqsubseteq_P \langle S_2, I_2 \rangle}$$

• Code can use privileges *P* to

remove a principal in *P* from the secrecy component of a label declassification
add a principal in *P* to an integrity

component of a label **w** endorsement

Haskell Implementations

- Labels for dynamic IFC systems
 Principals are strings
 Categories are sets of principals
 Components are sets categories
- Labels for static IFC systems
 Prototype implementation that enforces IFC for secrecy-only DC Labels (a la Curry-Howard) with no compiler modifications!

Conclusions

- Presented new label format: DC Labels
 Formalized using propositional logic
 - Proved several security properties
 - Showed their use in common design patterns
 - Presented two Haskell implementations
- Strength of DC Labels:
 - Model is simple & sound
 - Allows for specifying complex policies
 - Decentralized

Thank you!

\$> cabal install dclabel

www.scs.stanford.edu/~deian/dclabels