You Can't Touch This WG2.8 meeting 2012

Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg

Peter Thiemann Manuel Geffken Phillip Heidegger

University of Freiburg

thiemann@informatik.uni-freiburg.de

07 November 2012



Motivation



BURG

Thesis

The Full Employment Theorem for Research on JavaScript

There will always be another JavaScript feature

and and

REIBURG



UNI FREIBURG



UNI FREIBURG

O O SPIEG	EL ONLINE - Nachrichten		Z
SPIEGEL ONLINE - Nachrichten		> + • =	
Mein Zeug, Meine Clo		Mein Zeug Meine Cloud.	
swech, 18. Januar 2012 s GPIEGEL ONLINE	chlagzellen Hilfe RSS Newsletter Mobil Wietter TV-Programm		
ACHRICHTEN VIDEO THEMEN PORUM ENGLISH DER SPIEGEL SF ang Politik Wirtschaft Panorama Sport Kultur Netzweit Wissenschaft einestag ang Der Themen Gosta Consortis I Euro-Krise I Internetizeren I Handball-Re-	VEGELTV ABO SHOP es Karriere Uni Schule Reise Auto	My Book" Live"	
votest gegen US-Internetsperren lackout für die Netzfreiheit			1
WordPress.com	Longontor (English		P.
to blog. Get started here	CENSORED	iviD	She .
Learn more or sign up now.	CENSORED	MEHR INFOS	
Fotos 🕨			- Com
s Web trägt Schwarz: Auf Dutzenden Websites hat der Protest gegen geplan -Gesetze zur Kontrolle des Internets begonnen. Wikipedia streikt, Google ve Feine Protest-Petition, Wordpress ist gepflastert mit Zensurschildern. Die ersatersmeinder fürsthe Ginerukon und Abtergeran, mahr. Liewein L	te rrinkt VIDEO >>		
Veltweite Internetgesetze: US-Konzerne lassen das Netz zensieren imstrittenes US-Internetgesetz: Wikipedia schaltet ab - aus Protest			
illiardenloch ommerzbank braucht noch mehr Kanital	Video >		

FREIBURG



You Can't Touch This



You Can't Touch This



Thiemann

You Can't Touch This

07/11/12 5 / 20







Problem



(Mandatory) Access Control for Mashups

- No access to private data of the client
- No access to sensitive resources

Problem



(Mandatory) Access Control for Mashups

- No access to private data of the client
- No access to sensitive resources

What is Needed?

- Demarcation between trusted and untrusted code
- Mashup-specific access-control policies
- Enforcement of these policies

Observation



In JavaScript, every resource is controlled by reading or writing a property in scope.

Examples

- document.location, document.cookie, ...
- document.write(),...
- window.onload, window.onkeypress, ...
- window.alert(), window.open(), ...
- node.data, node.innerHtml, ...
- myData.contacts.JohnDoe.email, ...

Controlling Access to Properties is Key!

Access Permissions — sets of object references

```
Perm (document, "location|cookie|write");
Perm (window, "/on.*/");
Perm (window, "alert|open");
Perm (document.documentElement, "*./data|innerHtml/");
Perm (myData, "*.email");
```

BURG

Controlling Access to Properties is Key!

Access Permissions — sets of object references

```
Perm (document, "location|cookie|write");
Perm (window, "/on.*/");
Perm (window, "alert|open");
Perm (document.documentElement, "*./data|innerHtml/");
Perm (myData, "*.email");
```

Building blocks

 $p ::= \operatorname{Perm}(e, path) \quad \text{anchored path set}$ $| \quad p \cup p \mid p \cap p \mid \neg p \quad \text{boolean operations}$ $| \quad \Omega \quad \text{universal permission}$

Thiemann

You Can't Touch This

BUR

Enforcing Restrictions



all sugar

EIBURG

Alternative: Permitted Accesses

UNI FREIBURG

Access Permissions

```
/* constructor for person */
function Person(nick, pass, mail) {
 this.nickname = nick;
 this.password = pass;
 this.email = mail;
}
function base_functionality() {
  var p = new Person("honda", "t243v3r", "mh@t2.com");
  ENFORCE( Allow (Perm (p, "nickname")),
    function() { mashup1 (p); });
  . . .
  var out = document.getElementById("for_mashup");
  ENFORCE( Allow (Perm (out, "*")),
    function() { mashup2 (out, ...); });
}
```

```
function mash(x, my) {
```

```
... my.secret ...
```

```
var r = ENFORCE(
   Deny(my, "secret"),
   function() {
      mash(x, my);
   }
}
```

```
});
```

}

Total States

EIBURG

UNI FREIBURG

```
function mash(x, my) {
    ... my.secret ...
```

}

```
var r = ENFORCE(
   Deny(my, "secret"),
   function() {
      mash(x, my);
   });
```

Lexical Scope

- Restriction applies only to subphrases of mash(x, my)
- Does not impose proper demarcation: untrusted body of mash

runs without restriction.

```
UNI
FREIBURG
```

```
function mash(x, my) {
    ... my.secret ...
```

}

```
var r = ENFORCE(
   Deny(my, "secret"),
   function() {
      mash(x, my);
   });
```

Dynamic Scope

- Restriction applies throughout execution of mash.
- Semantics of access permission contracts [POPL2012]

. . .

UNI FREIBURG

function mash(x, my) {
 return function() {

... my.secret

var r = ENFORCE(
 Deny(my, "secret"),
 function() {
 mash(x, my);
 });

r();// may access my.secret

Dynamic Scope

- Restriction applies throughout execution of mash.
- Semantics of access permission contracts [POPL2012]
- Does not impose proper demarcation:

If the untrusted mash returned a function, then r(), i.e., code produced by mash, would run without restriction.



function mash(x, my) {

return function() {

... my.secret ...

}

var r = ENFORCE(
 Deny(my, "secret"),
 function() {
 mash(x, my);
 });

r(); // no access to my.secret

Wrapper Semantics

- The restriction applies to the execution of mash(x, y) and to all functions and objects produced by it, recursively.
- If mash(x, y) returns a function, then the function call r() runs with (at least) the same restriction as mash.
- Fits the requirements.

UNI FREIBURG

function mash(x, my) {
 x()
}

```
var r = ENFORCE(
    Deny(my, "secret"),
    function() {
        mash(x, my);
    });
```

```
// @syscall
function x() {
```

... my.secret

Wrapper Semantics for Higher-Order Functions

- Suppose x is a function, which is called in mash's body.
- Which restriction applies to the execution of x(...)?
- Choice#1 (system call):
 x's creation-time restriction

Thiemann

You Can't Touch This

07/11/12 17 / 20



function mash(x, my) {
 ... x()...
}

```
var r = ENFORCE(
   Deny(my, "secret"),
   function() {
      mash(x, my);
   });
```

```
// @callback
function x() {
    ... my.secret ...
```

ł

Wrapper Semantics for Higher-Order Functions

- Suppose x is a function, which is called in mash's body.
- Which restriction applies to the execution of x(...)?
- Choice#1 (system call):
 x's creation-time restriction
- Choice#2 (callback): same plus the call-site's restriction

Who Should Use Access Restrictions?

- Implementer of base application wants to restrict mashups to guarantee confidentiality of the end user's data.
 - Explicit.
 - Instrumenting script tags.
- End user wants to restrict applications.
 - Global restriction.
 - Mapping: URL → restrictions.
 - Mapping prepared by third party; might be too complicated / tedious for end user.
- Implementer of mashup provides access restrictions: run time can check compatibility before executing

BURG

Project Status

- Formal, mechanized semantics
 - Properties of the semantics
 - Correctness of implementation
- Ongoing implementations in Rhino & Firefox
 - Security application requires total interposition
 - Only achievable in the JS engine (Thank you, eval & friends!)

Corresponding gradual type system

IBURG

The End

















Thiemann

You Can't Touch This

07/11/12

2 20 / 20