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Exercise Set 2 submissions
- We are using different Gradescope features for Exercise Set 2
- Create and submit a PDF document with your answers
  - Still prefer typed written answers, for readability
  - LaTeX and Google Docs templates available
- Gradescope submissions now available, include your group

Exercise Set 1 regrading
- This Wednesday will be the last day to request re-grades of Exercise Set 1 (via Gradescope)
- In particular, not entertained at the end of the semester

Trusted and trustworthy
- Part of your system is trusted if its failure can break your security
- Thus, OS is almost always trusted
- Real question: is it trustworthy?
- Distinction not universally observed: trusted boot, Trusted Solaris, etc.

Trusted (I/O) path
- How do you know you’re talking to the right software?
- And no one is sniffing the data?
- Example: Trojan login screen
  - Or worse: unlock screensaver with root password
  - Origin of “Press Ctrl-Alt-Del to log in”
Minimizing trust

- Kernel → microkernel → nanokernel
- Reference monitor concept
- TCB size: measured relative to a policy goal
- Reference monitor ⊆ TCB
  - But hard to build monitor for all goals

How to gain assurance

- Use for a long time
- Testing
- Code / design review
- Third-party certification
- Formal methods / proof

Evaluation / certification

- Testing and review performed by an independent party
- Goal: separate incentives, separate accountability
- Compare with financial auditing
- Watch out for: form over substance, misplaced incentives

Orange book OS evaluation

- Trusted Computer System Evaluation Criteria
- D. Minimal protection
- C. Discretionary protection
  - C2 adds, e.g., secure audit over C1
- B. Mandatory protection
  - B1 < B2 < B3: stricter classic MLS
- A. Verified protection

Common Criteria

- International standard and agreement for IT security certification
- Certification against a protection profile, and evaluation assurance level EAL 1-7
- Evaluation performed by non-government labs
- Up to EAL 4 automatically cross-recognized

Common Criteria, Anderson’s view

- Many profiles don’t specify the right things
- OSes evaluated only in unrealistic environments
  - E.g., unpatched Windows XP with no network attacks
- “Corruption, Manipulation, and Inertia”
  - Pernicious innovation: evaluation paid for by vendor
  - Labs beholden to national security apparatus

Formal methods and proof

- Can math come to the rescue?
- Checking design vs. implementation
- Automation possible only with other tradeoffs
  - E.g., bounded size model
- Starting to become possible: machine-checked proof

Proof and complexity

- Formal proof is only feasible for programs that are small and elegant
- If you honestly care about assurance, you want your TCB small and elegant anyway
- Should provability further guide design?
Some hopeful proof results

- seL4 microkernel (SOSP'09 and ongoing)
  - 7.5 kL C, 200 kL proof, 160 bugs fixed, 25 person years
- CompCert C-subset compiler (PLDI'06 and ongoing)
- RockSalt SFI verifier (PLDI'12)
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"POSIX" ACLs

- Based on a withdrawn standardization
- More flexible permissions, still fairly Unix-like
- Multiple user and group entries
  - Decision still based on one entry
- Default ACLs: generalize group inheritance
- Command line: getfacl, setfacl

ACL legacy interactions

- Hard problem: don't break security of legacy code
  - Suggests: "fail closed"
- Contrary pressure: don't want to break functionality
  - Suggests: "fail open"
- POSIX ACL design: old group permission bits are a mask on all novel permissions

"POSIX" "capabilities"

- Divide root privilege into smaller (~35) pieces
- Note: not real capabilities
- First runtime only, then added to FS similar to setuid
- Motivating example: ping
- Also allows permanent disabling

Privilege escalation dangers

- Many pieces of the root privilege are enough to regain the whole thing
  - Access to files as UID 0
  - CAP_DAC_OVERRIDE
  - CAP_FOWNER
  - CAP_SYS_MODULE
  - CAP_MKNOD
  - CAP_PTRACE
  - CAP_SYS_ADMIN (mount)

Legacy interaction dangers

- Former bug: take away capability to drop privileges
- Use of temporary files by no-longer setuid programs
- For more details: "Exploiting capabilities", Emeric Nasi