

Secure Information Flow and Pointer Confinement in a Java-like Language

Anindya Banerjee and David A. Naumann

ab@cis.ksu.edu, naumann@cs.stevens-tech.edu

[Kansas State University](#) and [Stevens Institute of Technology](#)

www.cis.ksu.edu/~ab,

www.cs.stevens-tech.edu/~naumann

The Problem

- ◆ System with **H**igh and **L**ow inputs, $\textcolor{red}{L} \leq \textcolor{blue}{H}$.
- ◆ **H** \equiv **secret/private/classified**
- ◆ **L** users permitted to see **L** outputs.

(Security Policy: Confidentiality \equiv “PROTECT SECRETS”)

Formalise for systems programmed in Java-like languages.

The Problem

- ◆ System with **H**igh and **L**ow inputs, $\textcolor{red}{L} \leq \textcolor{blue}{H}$.
 $\textcolor{red}{H} \equiv \textcolor{red}{secret}/\textcolor{red}{private}/\textcolor{red}{classified}$
 - ◆ **L** users permitted to see **L** outputs.
- (Security Policy: Confidentiality \equiv “PROTECT SECRETS”)
- Formalise for systems programmed in Java-like languages.
- ◆ Noninterference (NI) [Goguen-Meseguer '82]
“No matter how **H** inputs change, **L** outputs remain **same**”.
 - ≡ No information flow from **H** to **L**.

Our Contribution

Type-based analysis for secure information flow.

- ◆ Sequential, Java-like language
 - ◆ private fields, class-based visibility
 - ◆ mutually recursive classes, methods
 - ◆ pointers, mutable state, dynamic allocation
 - ◆ inheritance, dynamic dispatch

Our Contribution

Type-based analysis

for secure information flow.

- ◆ Sequential, Java-like language
- ◆ Security type system

Our Contribution

Type-based analysis

for secure information flow.

- ◆ Sequential, Java-like language
- ◆ Security type system
- ◆ Data flow (*via mutable fields*)

Our Contribution

Type-based analysis

for secure information flow.

- ◆ Sequential, Java-like language
- ◆ Security type system
- ◆ Data flow ([via mutable fields](#))
- ◆ Control flow ([via dynamic dispatch](#))

Our Contribution

Type-based analysis

for secure information flow.

- ◆ Sequential, Java-like language
- ◆ Security type system
 - ◆ Data flow (*via mutable fields*)
 - ◆ Control flow (*via dynamic dispatch*)
- ◆ Proof of Noninterference (*denotational semantics, compositional proofs*)

What We Have Not Done

- ◆ Extension to full JavaCard
- ◆ Exceptions
- ◆ Protected fields, private/protected classes, interfaces, packages
- ◆ Extension to full Java
- ◆ Threads
- ◆ Class loading, Reflection, Native methods
- ◆ Generics
- ◆ ...

Previous Work: Main inspirations

- ◆ Noninterference: Goguen-Meseguer, Denning-Denning
- ◆ Type-based analyses for information flow:
 - 1996– Smith, Volpano (**Simple Imperative Language**)
 - 1999– Abadi et al. (**DCC – Info. flow as dependence analysis**)
 - 1999– Sabelfeld, Sands (**Threads, Poss. NI, Prob. NI**)
 - 1999 Myers (**Java – but NI open**)
 - 2000– Pottier, Simonet, Conchon (**Core ML**)

Previous Work: Main inspirations

- ◆ Abstract Interpretation based analyses for info. flow:

1992 Mizuno, Schmidt (**Logical relations to prove NI**)

Previous Work: Main inspirations

- ◆ Abstract Interpretation based analyses for info. flow:
- 1992 Mizuno, Schmidt (**Logical relations to prove NI**)
- Our focus:
 - ◆ Type-based analyses for information flow: (Smith, Volpano)
 - ◆ Cope with threads, non-determinism, stochastic processes, declassification, ...
 - ◆ **Cope with realistic programming languages.**

Example: Aliasing (1)

```
class LPatient extends Object {  
    //basic patient record  
  
    String name;  
  
    String getName() {return self.name;}  
  
    unit setName(String n) {self.name := n;} }
```

Example: Aliasing (1)

```
class LPatient extends Object {//basic patient record
    String name;
    String getName() {return self.name;}
    unit setName(String n) {self.name := n;} }

class XPatient extends LPatient {
    String hiv; //SECRET
    String getHIV() {return self.hiv;}
    unit setHIV(String s) {self.hiv := s;} }
```

Example: Aliasing (1)

```
LPatient lp := readFile();
String LBuf := lp.getName(); String HBuf := lp.getName();

LBuf ~ lp.name ~ HBuf

XPatient xp:= new XPatient(); xp.setName(LBuf);

LBuf ~ lp.name ~ HBuf ~ xp.name
```

Example: Aliasing (1)

```
LPatient lp := readFile();
String LBuf := lp.getName(); String HBuf := lp.getName();

LBuf ~ lp.name ~ HBuf

XPatient xp:= new XPatient(); xp.setName(LBuf);

LBuf ~ lp.name ~ HBuf ~ xp.name

String HBuf := readFromTrustedChannel(); xp.setHIV(HBuf);

HBuf ~ xp.hiv;

LBuf ~ lp.name ~ xp.name
```

Example: Aliasing (1)

```
LPatient lp := readFile();
String LBuf := lp.getName(); String HBuf := lp.getName();

LBuf ~ lp.name ~ HBuf

XPatient xp:= new XPatient(); xp.setName(LBuf);

LBuf ~ lp.name ~ HBuf ~ xp.name

String HBuf := readFromTrustedChannel(); xp.setHIV(HBuf);

HBuf ~ xp.hiv;
LBuf ~ lp.name ~ xp.name

LBuf := HBuf; lp.setName(xp.getHIV())
```

Example: Aliasing (1)

```
LPatient lp := readFile();
String LBuf := lp.getName(); String HBuf := lp.getName();

LBuf ~ lp.name ~ HBuf

XPatient xp:= new XPatient(); xp.setName(LBuf);

LBuf ~ lp.name ~ HBuf ~ xp.name

String HBuf := readFromTrustedChannel(); xp.setHIV(HBuf);

HBuf ~ xp.hiv; LBuf ~ lp.name ~ xp.name

LBuf := HBuf; lp.setName(xp.getHIV())

lp.name ~ xp.hiv
```

Annotated Types Prevent Direct Data Flows

```
class LPatient extends Object {  
    (String, L) name;  
    (String, L) getName() {return self.name;}  
    (unit, L) setName((String, L) n) {self.name := n;} }  
  
class XPatient extends LPatient {  
    (String, H) hiv; //SECRET  
    (String, H) getHIV() {return self.hiv;}  
    (unit, L) setHIV((String, H) s) {self.hiv := s;} }
```

No direct assignment from H to L

Example: Aliasing (1) Revisited

```
(LPatient, L) lp := readFile();
(String, L) LBuf := lp.getName();
(String, H) HBuf := lp.getName();

(XPatient, L) xp:= new XPatient();    xp.setName(LBuf :L);
(String, H) HBuf:= readTrusted...;    xp.setHIV(HBuf :H);
```

Example: Aliasing (1) Revisited

```
(LPatient, L) lp := readFile();  
(String, L) LBuf := lp.getName();  
(String, H) HBuf := lp.getName();  
  
(XPatient, L) xp := new XPatient(); xp.setName(LBuf :L);  
(String, H) HBuf := readTrusted...; xp.setHIV(HBuf :H);  
  
LBuf : (String,L) := HBuf : (String,H)  
  
lp.setName( xp.getHIV() : (String,H) )
```

Example: Aliasing (1) Revisited

```
class LPatient L extends Object {  
    (String, L) name;  
    (String, L) getName() {return self.name;}  
    (unit, L) setName((String, L) n) {self.name := n;} }  
  
class XPatient L extends LPatient {  
    (String, H) hiv; //SECRET  
    (String, H) getHIV() {return self.hiv;}  
    (unit, L) setHIV((String, H) s) {self.hiv := s;} }
```

Example: Aliasing (2)

```
class LPatient L extends Object {  
    //name, getName, setName  
    (String, L) passSelf() {  
        ...o.m(self)... // m has L argument}}  
  
class XPatient L extends LPatient { //hiv, getHIV, setHIV}
```

Example: Aliasing (2)

```
class LPatient L extends Object {  
    //name, getName, setName  
    (String, L) passSelf() {  
        ...o.m(self)... // m has L argument}}  
  
class XPatient L extends LPatient { //hiv, getHIV, setHIV}  
  
class HPatient H extends XPatient { //inherits passSelf()}
```

Example: Aliasing (2)

```
class LPatient L extends Object {  
    ...  
    (String, L) passSelf() {...o.m(self)...}  
    class XPatient L extends LPatient {...}  
    class HPatient H extends XPatient //inherits passSelf()  
    ◆ Require: H-subclass of L-class overrides all inherited  
    methods.
```

Example: Aliasing (2)

```
class LPatient L extends Object {  
    ...  
    (String, L) passSelf() {...o.m(self)...}  
    class XPatient L extends LPatient {...}  
    class HPatient H extends XPatient //inherits passSelf()  
  
◆ Require: H-subclass of L-class overrides all inherited  
methods.  
  
◆ Restrictive: Why override getName?  
(String, L) getName() {return self.name;}
```

Example: Aliasing (2)

```
class LPatient L extends Object {  
    ...  
    (String, L) passSelf() {...o.m(self)...}  
    class XPatient L extends LPatient {...}  
    class HPatient H extends XPatient {//inherits passSelf()  
        ◆ Require: H-subclass of L-class overrides all inherited  
        methods.  
        ◆ Restrictive: Why override getName?  
        (String, L) getName() {return self.name;}  
        ◆ Use anonymous method(?) "self" not leaked...
```

Example: Control Flow (Conditional)

```
class XPatient L extends LPatient { //hiv, getHIV, setHIV}

String leakStatus(){
    var String s; //level of s???
    if (self.hiv) {s := 'YES'} else {s := 'NO'};
    return s;
}
```

Example: Control Flow (Conditional)

```
class XPatient L extends LPatient { //hiv, getHIV, setHIV}

(String, H) leakStatus(){
    var (String, H) s; //level of s???
    if (self.hiv) {s := "YES";} else {s := "NO";}
    return s;
}
```

If guard is H, only H-variables and H-fields may be modified.

Example: Control Flow (Dynamic Dispatch)

```
class XPatient L extends LPatient { //hiv, ...
```

```
class YN L extends Object {(bool, L)val() {return true;}}
```

```
class Y L extends YN {(bool, L)val() {return true;}}
```

```
class N L extends YN {(bool, L)val() {return false;}}
```

Example: Control Flow (Dynamic Dispatch)

```
class XPatient L extends LPatient { //hiv, ...
(YN, H) leak(){
    var (YN, H) o;
    if (self.hiv) {o := new Y();} else {o := new N();}
    return o;}}
```

```
class YN L extends Object { (bool, L) val() {return true;}}
class Y L extends YN { (bool, L) val() {return true;}}
class N L extends YN { (bool, L) val() {return false;}}
```

Example: Control Flow (Dynamic Dispatch)

```
class XPatient L extends LPatient { //hiv, ...
(YN, H) leak(){
var (YN, H) o;
if (self.hiv) {o := new Y();} else {o := new N();}
return o;}
xp.leak() : (YN, H);

class YN L extends Object {(bool, L)val() {return true;}}
class Y L extends YN {(bool, L)val() {return true;}}
class N L extends YN {(bool, L)val() {return false;}}
```

Example: Control Flow (Dynamic Dispatch)

```
class XPatient L extends LPatient { //hiv, ...
(YN, H) leak(){
var (YN, H) o;
if (self.hiv) {o := new Y();} else {o := new N();}
return o;}
xp.leak() : (YN, H);   xp.leak().val() : (bool, ???)
class YN L extends Object {(bool, L)val() {return true;}}
class Y L extends YN {(bool, L)val() {return true;}}
class N L extends YN {(bool, L)val() {return false;}}
```

Example: Control Flow (Dynamic Dispatch)

```
class XPatient L extends LPatient { //hiv, ...
  (YN, H) leak(){...}
}

xp.leak() : (YN, H)
xp.leak().val() : (bool, H)
```

If level of receiver H, level of returned result from method call H.

Example: Dynamic Dispatch – Leaks via Heap

```
class YNh L extends Object {  
    bool v;  
    bool val() {return self.v;}  
    unit setv(bool w) {self.v := w;}  
    unit set() {self.setv(true);}  
  
class Yh L extends YNh {unit set() {self.setv(true);}}  
class Nh L extends YNh {unit set() {self.setv(false);}}
```

Example: Dynamic Dispatch – Leaks via Heap

```
class YNh L extends Object {  
    bool v; //level of v???  
    bool val() {return self.v;}  
    unit setv(bool w) {self.v := w;}  
    unit set() {self.setv(true);} }  
x := xp.leak(); //x: (YNh, H)  
x.set();  
  
class Yh L extends YNh {unit set() {self.setv(true);}}  
class Nh L extends YNh {unit set() {self.setv(false);}}
```

Example: Dynamic Dispatch – Leaks via Heap

```
class YNh L extends Object {  
    bool v; //level of v???  
    bool val() {return self.v;}  
    unit setv(bool w) {self.v := w;}  
    unit set() {self.setv(true);} }  
x := xp.leak(); //x: (YNh, H)  
x.set(); ... x.val()...  
  
class Yh L extends YNh {unit set() {self.setv(true);}}  
class Nh L extends YNh {unit set() {self.setv(false);}}
```

Example: Dynamic Dispatch – Leaks via Heap

```
class YNh L extends Object {  
    (bool, H) v;  
    (bool, H) val() {return self.v;}  
    (unit, L) setv((bool, H) w) {self.v := w;}  
    (unit, L) set() {self.setv(true);}  
  
    x := xp.leak(); x.set(); ... x.val() :H ...
```

If level of receiver **H**, only **H**-fields may be modified in meth. call

Pointer Confinement

- ◆ L-object may be aliased by L-var, H-var
 - ◆ L-class may have H-subclass
- ∴ Show L-Confinement:

1. L-vars, L-fields do not contain H-pointers.
2. Meaning of L-expression never H-pointer.

Pointer Confinement

- ◆ L-object may be aliased by L-var, H-var
 - ◆ L-class may have H-subclass
- ∴ Show L-Confinement:
1. L-vars, L-fields do not contain H-pointers.
 2. Meaning of L-expression never H-pointer.
- ◆ In *conditionals/dyn. dispatch*, assignment may be confined to H-vars, H-fields.
- ∴ Show H-Confinement:
- Input states, output states *indistinguishable* by L.

Formalisation

Types:

$$\begin{array}{lcl} \kappa & ::= & L \mid H \\ T & ::= & \text{unit} \mid \text{bool} \mid C \\ \tau & ::= & (T, \kappa) \text{ // security type} \end{array}$$

Formalisation

Types:

$$\begin{array}{lcl} \kappa & ::= & L \mid H \\ T & ::= & \text{unit} \mid \text{bool} \mid C \\ \tau & ::= & (T, \kappa) \text{ // security type} \end{array}$$

Typing Judgements:

$$\begin{array}{l} \Delta \vdash e : (T, \kappa) \text{ // } \Delta \text{ security type context} \\ \Delta \vdash S : (\text{com } \kappa_1, \kappa_2) \end{array}$$

Formalisation

Types:

$$\begin{array}{lcl} \kappa & ::= & L \mid H \\ T & ::= & \text{unit} \mid \text{bool} \mid C \\ \tau & ::= & (T, \kappa) \text{ // security type} \end{array}$$

Typing Judgements:

$$\begin{array}{l} \Delta \vdash e : (T, \kappa) \text{ // } \Delta \text{ security type context} \\ \Delta \vdash S : (\text{com } \kappa_1, \kappa_2) \end{array}$$

“assign to vars $\geq \kappa_1$, update fields $\geq \kappa_2$ ”

Formalisation

Meanings of Typing Judgements:

$$\llbracket \Delta^\dagger \vdash e : T \rrbracket^{\mu\eta h}, \quad \llbracket \Delta^\dagger \vdash S : \text{com} \rrbracket^{\mu\eta h}$$

$\mu \equiv$ Method Environment $\eta \equiv$ Stack $h \equiv$ Heap $(\eta, h) \equiv$ State

$$\eta \in \llbracket \Delta^\dagger \rrbracket$$

Formalisation

Meanings of Typing Judgements:

$$\llbracket \Delta^\dagger \vdash e : T \rrbracket \mu \eta h, \quad \llbracket \Delta^\dagger \vdash S : \text{com} \rrbracket \mu \eta h$$

$\mu \equiv$ Method Environment $\eta \equiv$ Stack $h \equiv$ Heap $(\eta, h) \equiv$ State

$$\eta \in \llbracket \Delta^\dagger \rrbracket$$

Related States $(\eta, h) \sim (\eta', h')$ are *indistinguishable* by L .

$\eta \sim \eta'$, iff $\forall x \in \text{dom } \Delta$, if $(T, L) = \Delta x$ then $\eta x = \eta' x$;
 $h \sim h'$ iff same L -locations and those have equal L -fields.

Safe Expressions

Suppose:

- ◆ $\Delta \vdash e : (\Gamma, L)$
- ◆ $(\eta, h) \sim (\eta', h')$
- ◆ μ, η, η', h, h' are L -confined
- ◆ *safe* μ

- ◆ $\llbracket \Delta^\dagger \vdash e : \Gamma \rrbracket \mu \eta h \neq \perp \neq \llbracket \Delta^\dagger \vdash e : \Gamma \rrbracket \mu \eta' h'$

Then:

$$\llbracket \Delta^\dagger \vdash e : \Gamma \rrbracket \mu \eta h = \llbracket \Delta^\dagger \vdash e : \Gamma \rrbracket \mu \eta' h'$$

Safe Expressions

Suppose:

- ◆ $\Delta \vdash e : (\top, L)$
- ◆ $(\eta, h) \sim (\eta', h')$
- ◆ μ, η, η', h, h' are L -confined
- ◆ *safe* μ (i.e., method call in L -confined μ, η, η', h, h' ,
 $(\eta, h) \sim (\eta', h')$, yields related heaps and (if non- \perp)
returns equal results if return type of method is L)
- ◆ $\llbracket \Delta^\dagger \vdash e : T \rrbracket \mu \eta h \neq \perp \neq \llbracket \Delta^\dagger \vdash e : T \rrbracket \mu \eta' h'$

Then:

$$\llbracket \Delta^\dagger \vdash e : T \rrbracket \mu \eta h = \llbracket \Delta^\dagger \vdash e : T \rrbracket \mu \eta' h'$$

Safe Commands

Suppose:

- ◆ $\Delta \vdash S : (\text{com } \kappa_1, \kappa_2)$
- ◆ μ is H -confined

◆ ...same as for expressions ...

- ◆ $\llbracket \Delta^\dagger \vdash S : \text{com} \rrbracket \mu \eta h \neq \perp \neq \llbracket \Delta^\dagger \vdash S : \text{com} \rrbracket \mu \eta' h'$.

Then *output states related*: $(\eta_0, h_0) \sim (\eta'_0, h'_0)$ where

$$(\eta_0, h_0) = \llbracket \Delta^\dagger \vdash S : \text{com} \rrbracket \mu \eta h$$

$$(\eta'_0, h'_0) = \llbracket \Delta^\dagger \vdash S : \text{com} \rrbracket \mu \eta' h'$$

Ongoing/Future Work

- ◆ Extension to full JavaCard
- ◆ Extension to full Java
 - ◆ **Threads**
 - ◆ **Generics**
 - ◆ ...
- ◆ Termination-insensitivity
- ◆ Inference of annotations (Pottier et. al.)
- ◆ Declassification (Halpern&O'Neill, Myers&Zdancewic)

L-confinement (ok)

- ◆ Define $LLoc = \{\ell \in Loc \mid level\ell = L\}$.
- ◆ For heaps, define $ok h$ iff for all $\ell \in dom h$ and every $f \in fields(loctype \ell)$, if $stype(f, loctype \ell) = (T, L)$ for some T and $h\ell f \in Loc$ then $h\ell f \in LLoc$.
- ◆ For environments, define $ok \Delta \eta$ iff for every x with $\Delta x = (T, L)$ for some T , if $\eta x \in Loc$ then $\eta x \in LLoc$.
- ◆ For method environments, define $ok \mu$ iff the following holds: for every m, C, η, h , if $ok h$, $ok \Delta \eta$, and $\mu C^m \eta h \neq \perp$ then $ok \mu$ and $\kappa_3 = L \wedge d \in Loc \Rightarrow d \in LLoc$,

where $sntype(m, C) = (\bar{T}, \bar{\kappa}) \xrightarrow{\kappa_2} (T, \kappa_3)$
 $pars(m, C) = (\bar{x} : (\bar{T}, \bar{\kappa}))$
 Δ
 $= \bar{x} : (\bar{T}, \bar{\kappa}), \text{self} : (C, level/C)$
 (d, h_0)
 $= \mu C m \eta h$

Type Rules

$C = \Gamma \text{self}$

$\Gamma f \in dfields C$

$\Gamma \vdash e_1 : C$

$\Gamma \vdash e_2 : U \quad U \leq T$

$\Gamma \vdash e_1.f := e_2 : com$

Type Rules

$C = \Gamma \text{self}$

$\Gamma f \in dfields C$

$\Gamma \vdash e_1 : C$

$\Gamma \vdash e_2 : U \quad U \leq T$

$\Gamma \vdash e_1.f := e_2 : com$

$mtype(m, D) = \bar{T} \rightarrow T$

$\Gamma \vdash e : D \quad \Gamma \vdash \bar{e} : \bar{U} \quad \bar{U} \leq \bar{T}$

$\Gamma \vdash e.m(\bar{e}) : com$

Security Type Rules

$$\frac{x \neq \text{self} \quad T_2 \leq T_1 \quad \kappa_2 \leq \kappa_1 \quad \kappa_3 \leq \kappa_1}{\Delta, x : (T_1, \kappa_1) \vdash e : (T_2, \kappa_2)}$$

$$\Delta, x : (T_1, \kappa_1) \vdash x := e : (\text{con } \kappa_3, \kappa_4)$$

Security Type Rules

$x \neq \text{self}$ $T_2 \leq T_1$ $\kappa_2 \leq \kappa_1$ $\kappa_3 \leq \kappa_1$

$\Delta, x : (T_1, \kappa_1) \vdash e : (T_2, \kappa_2)$

$\Delta, x : (T_1, \kappa_1) \vdash x := e : (\text{com } \kappa_3, \kappa_4)$

$(T, \kappa_2)f \in \text{sf}ields C$

$\Delta \vdash e_1 : (C, \kappa_1)$ $\Delta \vdash e_2 : (U, \kappa_3)$

$U \leq T$ $\kappa_1 \sqcup \kappa_3 \sqcup \kappa_5 \leq \kappa_2$

$\Delta \vdash e_1.f := e_2 : (\text{com } \kappa_4, \kappa_5)$

smtyp(m, D) = (\bar{T} , $\bar{\kappa}$) $\xrightarrow{\kappa_3}$ (T, κ_2)

$\Delta \vdash e : (D, \kappa_4)$ $\Delta \vdash \bar{e} : (\bar{U}, \bar{\kappa}_5)$

$\bar{U} \leq \bar{T}$ $\bar{\kappa}_5 \leq \bar{\kappa}$ $\kappa_4 \sqcup \kappa_7 \leq \kappa_3$

$\Delta \vdash e.m(\bar{e}) : (com, \kappa_6, \kappa_7)$