Security-Typed Programming within Dependently-Typed Programming

Dan Licata Joint work with Jamie Morgenstern

Carnegie Mellon University

Supported by NSF CCF-0702381 and CNS-0716469

Security-Typed Programming

* Access control: who gets access to what? read a file play a song make an FFI call

Information flow: what can they do with it? post the file contents on a blog copy the mp3 save the result in a database Security-Typed Programming

* Access control: who gets access to what? read a file play a song make an FFI call

Information flow: what can they do with it? post the file contents on a blog copy the mp3 save the result in a database

Access Control

Access control list (ACL) for secret.txt



Read secret.txt



Alice: r Bob: rw

Server



Access Control

Access control list (ACL) for secret.txt



Enforcement: Authentication + ACL lookup

Dan Licata and Jamie Morgenstern

Decentralized Access Control



Decentralized Access Control



Decentralized Access Control

ACM **says** ∀ s:principal, ∀ i:principal, ∀ p:paper, (member(i) ∧ i **says** student(s)) ⊃ MayRead(s, p)

CMU says student(Alice)



Proof Carrying Authorization

[Appel+Felten]



Dan Licata and Jamie Morgenstern

Proof Carrying Authorization

[Appel+Felten]



Proof Carrying Authorization









An API for PCA

read : prin \rightarrow file \rightarrow proof \rightarrow contents



An API for PCA

read : prin \rightarrow file \rightarrow proof \rightarrow contents



An API for PCA

read : prin \rightarrow file \rightarrow proof \rightarrow contents e.g. read(Alice, paper.pdf,p)

Problems:

* p might not be a well-formed proof

* p might not be a proof of the right theorem!

Dependent Types!

read : prin→ file → proof → contents

read : (k : prin) (f : file) (p : proof(mayread(k,f)) → contents

Dependent Types!

read : prin→ file → proof → contents

read : (k : prin) (f : file) (p : proof(mayread(k,f)) → contents

* typing ensures p is a well-formed proof

* theorem is explicit in p's type

Verification Spectrum



* Predict the policy

* Prove consequences statically

* Failures only if prediction was wrong * Do all proving at run-time

dynamic

Verification Spectrum

static

Reuse proofs for several API calls dynamic

- * Predict the policy
- * Prove consequences statically
- * Failures only if prediction was wrong

* Do all proving at run-time

Dependent PCA

Several new languages:

- # PCML5 [Avijit,Datta,Harper, TLDI'10]
- # Aura [Jia, Vaughan, Zdancewic, et al., ICFP'08]
- # Fine [Swamy,Chen,Chugh, ESOP'10]
- # F7 [Gordon,Bengston,Bhargavan,Fournet,Maffeis, CSF'08]

This paper:

We can do security-typed programming within an existing dependently-typed language

Our library

Supports programming as in *** PCML5 [Avijit,Datta,Harper, TLDI'10] * Aura [Jia,Vaughan,Zdancewic,et al., ICFP'08] * Fine [Swamy,Chen,Chugh, ESOP'10]**

F7 [Gordon,Bengston,Bhargavan,Fournet,Maffeis, CSF'08]



Aglet: Security-typed Programming in Agda

1.Representing an authorization logic

2.Compile-time and run-time theorem proving

3. Stateful and dynamic policies

Aglet: Security-typed Programming in Agda

1.Representing an authorization logic

2.Compile-time and run-time theorem proving

3. Stateful and dynamic policies

Dependent Types!

read : file → prin → proof → contents

read : (k : prin) (f : file) (p : proof(mayread(k,f)) → contents

* typing ensures p is a well-formed proof
* theorem is explicit in p's type

Representing BL₀ [Garg+Pfenning]

CMU says student(Alice)



says(Prin CMU, student(Prin Alice))

Security-Typed Programming within DTP

CMU says student(Alice)

. . .



says(Prin CMU, student(Prin Alice))

data Propo where says : Principal → Propo → Propo

Sequent as indexed inductive definition:

 $\Gamma \vdash A$ \longrightarrow data $_\vdash_: Ctx \rightarrow Propo \rightarrow Type$

Sequent as indexed inductive definition:

 $\Gamma \vdash A$ \longrightarrow data $_\vdash_: Ctx \rightarrow Propo \rightarrow Type$

Classifying only well-formed derivations:



Sequent as indexed inductive definition:

 $\Gamma \vdash A$ \longrightarrow data $_\vdash_: Ctx \rightarrow Propo \rightarrow Type$

Classifying only well-formed derivations:

 $\mathcal{D}_{\Gamma \vdash A} \longleftrightarrow \mathcal{D}: \Gamma \vdash A$

Inference rules as datatype constructors:

 $\frac{\Gamma, A \vdash B}{\Gamma \vdash A \supset B} \longrightarrow$

 $\supset R : \forall \{\Gamma A B\}$ $\rightarrow (A :: \Gamma) \vdash B$ $\rightarrow \Gamma \vdash (A \supset B)$

Sequent as indexed inductive definition:

 $\Gamma \vdash A$ \longrightarrow data $_\vdash_: Ctx \rightarrow Propo \rightarrow Type$

Classifying only well-formed derivations:

 $\begin{array}{c} \mathcal{D} \\ \Gamma \vdash A \end{array} \longleftrightarrow \mathcal{D} : \Gamma \vdash A \end{array}$

Inference rules as datatype constructors:

 $\frac{\Gamma, A \vdash B}{\Gamma \vdash A \supset B} \longrightarrow$

$$\Rightarrow R : \forall \{\Gamma A B\}$$
$$\rightarrow (A :: \Gamma) \vdash B$$
$$\rightarrow \Gamma \vdash (A \supset B)$$

dependent de Bruijn indices

BLO [Garg+Pfenning]

Logic with says modality: CMU says student(Alice)



principal we're reasoning as

Fj = Fall as "Jamie"

```
jread : \bigcirc \Gammaj String (\lambda \rightarrow \Gammaj)
jread = read (> Prin "Jamie") (> File "secret.txt") ?
jreadprint : \bigcirc \Gammaj Unit (\lambda \rightarrow \Gammaj)
jreadprint = jread >>= \lambda x \rightarrow
                 print ("the secret is: " ^ x)
 drdprnt : ([all as "Dan") Unit (\lambda \rightarrow [all as "Dan")
 drdprnt = sudo (> Prin "Dan" ) (> Prin "Jamie")
                  (solve proveReplace)
                  (\lambda \rightarrow \text{solve proveReplace})
                  (solve (prove 15))
                  jreadprint
```

Γj = Γall as "Jamie"

```
jread : \bigcirc \Gammaj String (\lambda \rightarrow \Gammaj)
jread = read (> Prin "Jamie") (> File "secret.txt") ?
jreadprint : \bigcirc [ J ] Unit (\lambda \rightarrow J ])
jreadprint = jread >>= \lambda x \rightarrow
                print ("the secret is: " ^ x)
 drdprnt : ([all as "Dan") Unit (\lambda \rightarrow [all as "Dan")
 drdprnt = sudo (> Prin "Dan" ) (> Prin "Jamie")
                  (solve proveReplace)
                  (\lambda \rightarrow \text{solve proveReplace})
                  (solve (prove 15))
                  jreadprint
```
Outline

1.Representing an authorization logic

2.Compile-time and run-time theorem proving

3. Stateful and dynamic policies

Theorem Prover

We implemented a *certified* theorem prover:

prove : $(\Theta : Ctx) (A : Propo) \rightarrow Maybe (\Theta \vdash A)$

Theorem Prover

We implemented a *certified* theorem prover:

prove : (n : nat) (Θ : Ctx) (A : Propo) \rightarrow Maybe ($\Theta \vdash A$) f search depth

Theorem Prover

We implemented a *certified* theorem prover:

prove : (n : nat) (Θ : Ctx) (A : Propo) \rightarrow Maybe ($\Theta \vdash A$) f search depth

Important that Propos are inductive!

data Propo where
says : Principal → Propo → Propo

1 1 1

Verification Spectrum



- * Predict the policy
- * Prove consequences statically
- * Failures only if prediction was wrong

* Do all proving at run-time

dynamic



Run-time Proving

prove : (n:nat) (Θ : Ctx) (A : Prop) \rightarrow Maybe ($\Theta \vdash A$)

tryRead : Ctx \rightarrow Prin \rightarrow File \rightarrow Maybe(String) tryRead Γ k f = case (prove 15 Γ Mayread(f,p)) of None \rightarrow None Some proof \rightarrow Some (read k f proof)

Run-time Proving

prove : (n:nat) (Θ : Ctx) (A : Prop) \rightarrow Maybe ($\Theta \vdash A$)

tryRead : Ctx \rightarrow Prin \rightarrow File \rightarrow Maybe(String) tryRead Γ k f = case (prove 15 Γ Mayread(f,p)) of None \rightarrow None Some proof \rightarrow Some (read k f proof)

use prove like "look up in ACL"





For **Fpol** a static (known at compile-time) policy:

Fpol = CMU says student(Alice) :: ACM says A :: ...

For a call

read(Alice, paper.pdf, ?)

can verify at compile-time that ? can be filled in

Compile-time Proving Fpol =

ACM says...

proof? : Maybe ($\Gamma pol \vdash Mayread(Alice, paper.pdf)$) proof? = prove 15 Γpol (Mayread(Alice, paper.pdf))

Compile-time Proving Fpol =

ACM says...

proof? : Maybe ($\Gamma pol \vdash Mayread(Alice, paper.pdf)$) proof? = prove 15 Γpol (Mayread(Alice, paper.pdf))

* proof? computes to either None or Some(pf)

Compile-time Proving Fpol =

ACM says...

proof? : Maybe (Γpol ⊢ Mayread(Alice, paper.pdf)) proof? = prove 15 Γpol (Mayread(Alice, paper.pdf))

proof? computes to either None or Some(pf)

run at compile-time and get value out

ML/Haskell:

valOf : Maybe $A \rightarrow A$

run-time error if it's None

ML/Haskell:

valOf : Maybe $A \rightarrow A$

run-time error if it's None

Agda:

valOf : (s : Maybe A) \rightarrow ? \rightarrow A only well-typed if s is equal to Some(pf)

IsSome : $\forall \{A\} \rightarrow Maybe A \rightarrow Type$ IsSome (Some _) = Unit IsSome None = Void

IsSome : $\forall \{A\} \rightarrow Maybe A \rightarrow Type$ IsSome (Some _) = Unit IsSome None = Void

valOf : $\forall \{A\} \rightarrow (s : Maybe A) \rightarrow IsSome s \rightarrow A$ valOf (Some x) _ = x valOf None (v) = ?

IsSome : $\forall \{A\} \rightarrow Maybe A \rightarrow Type$ IsSome (Some _) = Unit IsSome None = Void

valOf : $\forall \{A\} \rightarrow (s : Maybe A) \rightarrow IsSome s \rightarrow A$ valOf (Some x) _ = x valOf None (v : IsSome None) = ?

IsSome : $\forall \{A\} \rightarrow Maybe A \rightarrow Type$ IsSome (Some _) = Unit IsSome None = Void

valOf : $\forall \{A\} \rightarrow (s : Maybe A) \rightarrow IsSome s \rightarrow A$ valOf (Some x) _ = x valOf None (v: Void) = ?

IsSome : $\forall \{A\} \rightarrow Maybe A \rightarrow Type$ IsSome (Some _) = Unit IsSome None = Void

valOf : $\forall \{A\} \rightarrow (s : Maybe A) \rightarrow IsSome s \rightarrow A$ valOf (Some x) _ = x valOf None (v: Void) = impossibe v

the Proof : $\Gamma pol \vdash Mayread(Alice, paper.pdf)$ the Proof = valOf proof? <>

Given

valOf : \forall {A} \rightarrow (s : Maybe A) \rightarrow IsSome s \rightarrow A proof? : Maybe (Γ pol \vdash Mayread(Alice, paper.pdf))

the Proof : $\Gamma pol \vdash Mayread(Alice, paper.pdf)$ the Proof = valOf proof? <>

> Agda type error if theorem prover fails

Given

valOf : $\forall \{A\} \rightarrow (s : Maybe A) \rightarrow IsSome s \rightarrow A$

proof? : Maybe (Гpol ⊢ Mayread(Alice, paper.pdf))

Outline

1.Representing an authorization logic

2.Compile-time and run-time theorem proving

3.Stateful and dynamic policies

read : (f : file) (k : prin) (p : $\Gamma \vdash mayread(k,f)$) $\rightarrow string$

read : (f : file) (k : prin) (p : $\Gamma \vdash mayread(k,f)$) $\rightarrow \bigcirc string$

read : (f : file) (k : prin) (p : $\Gamma \vdash mayread(k,f)$) $\rightarrow \bigcirc string$

represents the policy; where does it come from?

read : (f : file) (k : prin) (p : $\Gamma \vdash mayread(k,f)$) $\rightarrow \bigcirc string$

represents the policy; where does it come from?

Want policies to be:

dynamic: not known until run-time# stateful: can change during execution (chown)

Represent computations with a type

ΓΑΓ' policy before

policy after

[cf. HTT]



read : (f : file) (k : prin) (p : $\Gamma \vdash mayread(k,f)) \rightarrow \bigcirc \Gamma$ string Γ



read : (f : file) (k : prin) (p : $\Gamma \vdash mayread(k,f)) \rightarrow \bigcirc \Gamma$ string Γ

chown : (f : file) (k1 k2 : prin) (p : (Γ ,owns(k1,f)) \vdash maychown(k1,f)) \rightarrow (Γ ,owns(k1,f)) string (Γ ,owns(k2,f))

read : (f : file) (k : prin) (p : $\Gamma \vdash mayread(k,f)$) $\rightarrow \bigcirc \Gamma string \Gamma$

read : (f : file) (k : prin) (p : $\Gamma \vdash mayread(k,f)$) → ○ Γ string Γ need to track who you're running as [AH07]

running as k read : (f : file) (k : prin) (p : $\Gamma \vdash mayread(k,f) \& as(k))$ $\rightarrow \bigcirc \Gamma string \Gamma$

running as k read : (f : file) (k : prin) (p : $\Gamma \vdash mayread(k,f) \& as(k))$ $\rightarrow \bigcirc \Gamma string \Gamma$

sudo : (f : file) (k1 k2 : prin) \rightarrow Γ ,as(k1) \vdash maysu(k1,k2) \rightarrow \bigcirc (Γ ,as(k2)) C (Γ ',as(k2)) \rightarrow \bigcirc (Γ ,as(k1)) C (Γ ',as(k1))

More examples

- # file access control (more details)
- * located computation
- * combination with information flow
- * conference management server with several phases (submission, reviewing, notification, ...)
Summary

Can do security-typed programming within DTP

Indexed inductive definition to represent proofs

* Theorem prover to discharge proof obligations, run at compile-time and run-time

* Indexed monad to manage stateful+dynamic policies

How could a DTPL better support this application? * Speed or interface to theorem provers

* Reflection (prover works well at extremes but not in the middle)

Binding+scope (logic)

How could a DTPL better support this application? * Speed or interface to theorem provers term repr. / [Brady et al.] [Kariso]

* Reflection (prover works well at extremes
but not in the middle)

Binding+scope (logic)

How could a DTPL better support this application?

* Speed or interface to theorem provers
term repr. / [Brady et al.] [Kariso]

- * Reflection (prover works well at extremes but not in the middle) quoteGoal
- # Binding+scope (logic)

How could a DTPL better support this application?

* Speed or interface to theorem provers
term repr. / [Brady et al.] [Kariso]

- * Reflection (prover works well at extremes but not in the middle) quoteGoal
- # Binding+scope (logic)
 Dan's thesis, coming next month

Thanks for listening!

code at http://www.cs.cmu.edu/~drl

Summary

Can do security-typed programming within DTP

Indexed inductive definition to represent proofs

* Theorem prover to discharge proof obligations, run at compile-time and run-time

* Indexed monad to manage stateful+dynamic policies