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Problem

- My computer is running a process
- It makes a request to your computer
  - Asks for some secret data to process
  - Provides an input you depend on
- How do you know it is executing correctly?
- Example
  - ATM machine is uploading a transaction to the bank
  - How does the bank know that this ATM is running correctly, so the transaction can be considered legal?
What would you do?

- Nothing
- Proof by authority (Certificates)
  ‣ Tells you who, but not what
- Constrain the system (Secure Boot)
  ‣ Effective, limiting, but proof is implied
- Inspect the runtime state (Authenticated Boot)
  ‣ Flexible, attestable, but difficult to prove semantics
Secure Boot

• Check each stage in the boot process
  ‣ Is code that you are going to load acceptable?
  ‣ If not, terminate the boot process

• Must establish a **Root-of-Trust**
  ‣ A component trusted to speak for the correctness of others
  ‣ Assumed to be correct because errors are **undetectable**
AEGIS architecture (1997)
  • ROM checks the BIOS
  • BIOS checks expansion ROMS and boot block
  • Boot Loader checks the OS

Why not just boot from a floppy (DVD now)?

Is this a root of trust?

What can it verify?

How do we know it booted securely?
Authenticated Boot

- Secure boot enforces requirements and uses special hardware to ensure a specific system is booted
  - Implied verification (Good because it is)

- By contrast, we can measure each stage and have a verifier authenticate the correctness of the stage
  - Verifier must know how to verify correctness
  - Behavior is uncertain until verification
  - Can you verify yourself?

- What is our root-of-trust?
Outbound Authentication


• **Goals**: Securely boot the 4758 and prove to remote parties (combines secure boot and attestation)

• More specifically, relying party $P$ wants to prove that only entity $E$ holds key $K$
  
  ‣ $E$ is high integrity despite depending on several integrity-relevant events (e.g., boot and upgrade)

• **Defines a precise logic for reasoning about such properties**
  
  ‣ But, the 4758 is a very limited system (one application)
“A relying party needs to conclude that a particular key pair really belongs to a particular software entity within a particular untampered coprocessor.”

Why does this prove the integrity of the processing environment?

What else is needed to make this connection between the key and entity’s correctness?

IBM 4758 Secure coprocessor contains various hardware protections to isolated memory, manage keys, and perform updates.
Configurations and Epochs

- A *Layer N configuration* is the maximal period in which that layer is run-able, with an unchanging software environment in Layers 1, …, N.

- A *Layer N epoch* is the maximal period in which the layer can run and accumulate state.

- Software runs for an epoch, but any change to the software (integrity-relevant event) results in a new configuration.
  - Hardware constrains these events.

- What are other integrity-relevant events in conventional systems?
Execution History

- E wishes to prove it “owns” K by presenting a \( \text{Chain}(E, K, H) \) of certificates
  - H shows the chain of entities that certify E’s K before the current run R.
  - The chain speaks for the correctness of K, which the relying party P should trust.

- Implications: Only these entities should have access to the secrets and configuration of E
  - Hardware limits the set of integrity-relevant operations that can affect E
  - General purpose systems allow more operations
Dependency (Integrity)

- Each entity $E$ has a dependency set $D(E)$
  - An entity $E$ depends on entities that have read/write access to its secrets and write access to its code
    - In general purpose systems, it is primarily dependence on untrusted data that leads to integrity problems
  - $TrustSet(P)$ – set of entities that $P$ trusted
    - $TrustSet(P)$ should be a superset of the measured dependencies
- Implications
  - Dependency must be comprehensively defined
    - Initialization, Code Load, Subsequent Reads
Validation

• P wants to verify E depends only on its TrustSet(P)
  ▸ A run R, prefixed by H, defines an entity’s \( D_R(E) \)
  \[
  \text{Validate}(P, \text{Chain}(E, K, H)) \Rightarrow D_R(E) \subseteq \text{TrustSet}(P)
  \]
  ▸ Hardware protections imply \( D_R(E) \)
  ▸ If \( D_R(E) \) is in P’s trust set, then the chain is valid
  \[
  D_R(E) \subseteq \text{TrustSet}(P) \Rightarrow \text{Validate}(P, \text{Chain}(E, K, H))
  \]
• OA requires an entity E’s dependencies satisfy the trust set of P to validate that E owns K
Validation Implications

- Difficult for P to verify all entities, integrity relevant events, and dependencies
  - We just want a green light (iTurtle)
- Enforcement simplifies the protocol
  - OA makes this seem easy, but has a lot of constraints to simplify the problem
Trusted(?) Computing

- The Trusted Platform Module (TPM) brought authenticated boot into the main stream

- Essentially, the TPM offers few primitives
  - Measurement, cryptography, key generation, PRNG
  - Controlled by physical presence of the machine
  - BIOS is Core Root of Trust for Measurement (CRTM)

- Spec only discussed how to measure early boot phases and general userspace measurements
Authenticated Boot

- A lot of FUD and hate was generated around what it does and does not do

- Paladium/NGSCB architecture (Microsoft, 2002)
  - Use virtualization to split system
  - Measure the “trusted” part to prove its integrity before responding

- “Meet the emerging requirements of an interconnected world” -- Microsoft

- Take over the world – Ross Anderson and others
Linux Integrity Measurement

- **Problem**: How can we verify the software environment of networked systems?

- **Solution**: Extend TPM measurement architecture to measure system’s runtime (Software Stack)

- **Additional Goals**
  - Load-time integrity
  - Unobtrusive
  - Tamper-evident
  - Usability
• System integrity depends on several components
  ‣ Executables
    • Programs, libraries, kernel modules
  ‣ Configuration Files
    • httpd.conf, /etc/shadow
  ‣ Unstructured Input
    • Network data, keystrokes, basically everything else
IMA Implementation

- Place hooks throughout Linux kernel
  - Later added as an LSM and then special LIM hooks
- Extend TPM PCR at file load-time
  - PCR = SHA1(File || PCR)
- Applications instrumented to measure inputs
  - Bash scripts, interpreters...
- Verifying all events is difficult
  - Need known “good” values to validate measurements
  - Leverage OS distribution definitions
Limitations

- What does IMA prove?
- Can a system with a valid IMA attestation be malicious?
- What else can be done to improve attestations?
Take Away

• Programs on systems may be security-critical
  ‣ How do we determine if they are up to the task?

• Secure and authenticated boot processes enable a party to prove a system’s integrity satisfies some requirements
  ‣ Secure boot proves to local parties
  ‣ Authenticated boot for remote parties

• OA provides secure boot and authenticate boot for comprehensive control – of a simple device

• IMA provides authenticated boot for Linux