## CMPT 473 Software Quality Assurance

## Security

Nick Sumner - Fall 2014

- (C)onfidentiality
  - No unauthorized information leaks

- (C)onfidentiality
  - No unauthorized information leaks
- (I)ntegrity
  - No unauthorized data manipulation/corruption

- (C)onfidentiality
  - No unauthorized information leaks
- (I)ntegrity
  - No unauthorized data manipulation/corruption
- (A)vailability
  - The system must be accessible as needed (no DOS)

- (C)onfidentiality
  - No unauthorized information leaks
- (I)ntegrity
  - No unauthorized data manipulation/corruption
- (A)vailability
  - The system must be accessible as needed (no DOS)
- ... (A<sub>2</sub>)uthenticity
  - All actions are genuine, taken by the parties they claim/appear to be

Poor security comes from unintended behavior.

→ Quality software shouldn't allow such actions anyway.

- → Quality software shouldn't allow such actions anyway.
- While our testing techniques so far find some security issues, many slip through! Why?

- → Quality software shouldn't allow such actions anyway.
- While our testing techniques so far find some security issues, many slip through! Why?
  - We cannot test everything

- → Quality software shouldn't allow such actions anyway.
- While our testing techniques so far find some security issues, many slip through! Why?
  - We cannot test everything
  - Concessions form part of an attack surface
    - Networks, Software, People

- → Quality software shouldn't allow such actions anyway.
- While our testing techniques so far find some security issues, many slip through! Why?
  - We cannot test everything
  - Concessions form part of an attack surface
    - Networks, Software, People
- Need additional policies & testing methods that specifically address security

- Many ways to attack different programs
- MITRE groups the most common into:

- Many ways to attack different programs
- MITRE groups the most common into:
  - Insecure Interaction
    - Data sent between components in an insecure fashion

- Many ways to attack different programs
- MITRE groups the most common into:
  - Insecure Interaction
    - Data sent between components in an insecure fashion
  - Risky Resource Management
    - Bad creation, use, transfer, & destruction of resources

- Many ways to attack different programs
- MITRE groups the most common into:
  - Insecure Interaction
    - Data sent between components in an insecure fashion
  - Risky Resource Management
    - Bad creation, use, transfer, & destruction of resources
  - Porous Defenses
    - Standard security practices that are missing or incorrect

[http://cwe.mitre.org/top25/#Categories]

 Memory safety is a fundamental security issue for languages like C, C++, Assembly, ....

- Memory safety is a fundamental security issue for languages like C, C++, Assembly, ....
- General idea:
  - Accessing memory when you shouldn't be able to might read, write, or execute inappropriately

- Memory safety is a fundamental security issue for languages like C, C++, Assembly, ....
- General idea:
  - Accessing memory when you shouldn't be able to might read, write, or execute inappropriately
- Classic example:
  - stack buffer overflow attacks

- Memory safety is a fundamental security issue for languages like C, C++, Assembly, ....
- General idea:
  - Accessing memory when you shouldn't be able to might read, write, or execute inappropriately
- Classic example:
  - stack buffer overflow attacks
  - Read more input into a buffer than the buffer can hold....

- Memory safety is a fundamental security issue for languages like C, C++, Assembly, ....
- General idea:
  - Accessing memory when you shouldn't be able to might read, write, or execute inappropriately
- Classic example:
  - stack buffer overflow attacks
  - Read more input into a buffer than the buffer can hold....

How many of you recall what a stack frame looks like?

# 0xFFF Stack Addresses

```
void foo(char *input) {
  unsigned secureData;
  char buffer[16];
  strcpy(buffer, input);
}
```

0xFFF

```
Stack
     Previous Frame
Addresses
```

```
void foo(char *input) {
  unsigned secureData;
  char buffer[16];
  strcpy(buffer, input);
}
```

0xFFF

```
Stack
      Previous Frame
                                  Stack Growth
Addresses
```

```
void foo(char *input) {
  unsigned secureData;
  char buffer[16];
  strcpy(buffer, input);
}
```

Stack Growth

0xFFF

```
Stack
    Previous Frame
    Return Address
S
Addresse
    Old Frame Ptr
     secureData
     buffer[15]
     buffer[14]
     buffer[0]
```

```
void foo(char *input) {
  unsigned secureData;
  char buffer[16];
  strcpy(buffer, input);
}
```

Stack Frame for foo

Stack Growth

0xFFF

Stack Previous Frame Return Address S **Old Frame Ptr** Addresse secureData buffer[15] buffer[14] buffer[0]

```
void foo(char *input) {
  unsigned secureData;
  char buffer[16];
  strcpy(buffer, input);
}
```

Stack Frame for foo

What can go wrong?

0xFFF

Stack Previous Frame Return Address S Addresse Old Frame Ptr secureData buffer[15] buffer[14] buffer[0]

Stack Growth

```
void foo(char *input) {
  unsigned secureData;
  char buffer[16];
  strcpy(buffer, input);
}
```

0xFFF

```
Stack
    Previous Frame
    Return Address
                      Stack Growth
S
Addresse
     Old Frame Ptr
     secureData
     buffer[15]
     buffer[14]
      buffer[0]
```

```
void foo(char *input) {
  unsigned secureData;
  char buffer[16];
  strcpy(buffer, input);
}
```

0xFFF

Stack Previous Frame Return Address S Addresse Old Frame Ptr secureData buffer[15] buffer[14] buffer[0]

Stack Growth

```
void foo(char *input) {
  unsigned secureData;
  char buffer[16];
  strcpy(buffer, input);
}
```

The integrity of the secure data is corrupted.

0xFFF

Stack **Previous Frame** Return Address Stack Growth S Addresse Old Frame Ptr secureData buffer[15] buffer[14] buffer[0]

```
unsigned secureData;
char buffer[16];
strcpy(buffer, input);
}
```

void foo(char \*input) {

The integrity of the secure data is corrupted.

What else can go wrong?

0xFFF

Stack **Previous Frame** Return Address S Addresse Old Frame Ptr secureData buffer[15] buffer[14] buffer[0]

Stack Growth

```
void foo(char *input) {
  unsigned secureData;
  char buffer[16];
  strcpy(buffer, input);
}
```

Stack Growth

0xFFF

Stack **Previous Frame** Return Address S Addresse Old Frame Ptr secureData buffer[15] buffer[14] buffer[0]

```
void foo(char *input) {
  unsigned secureData;
  char buffer[16];
  strcpy(buffer, input);
}
```

What does this mean?

- Vulnerabilities come from reading/writing/freeing
  - Out of bounds pointers
  - Dangling pointers

- Vulnerabilities come from reading/writing/freeing
  - Out of bounds pointers
  - Dangling pointers
- Why doesn't Java face this issue?

- Vulnerabilities come from reading/writing/freeing
  - Out of bounds pointers
  - Dangling pointers
- Why doesn't Java face this issue?
- Is this intrinsic to languages like C++?
  - Why/Why not?

- Vulnerabilities come from reading/writing/freeing
  - Out of bounds pointers
  - Dangling pointers
- Why doesn't Java face this issue?
- Is this intrinsic to languages like C++?
  - Why/Why not?
- Are these still a real issue?

- Vulnerabilities come from reading/writing/freeing
  - Out of bounds pointers
  - Dangling pointers
- Why doesn't Java face this issue?
- Is this intrinsic to languages like C++?
  - Why/Why not?
- Are these still a real issue?
  - http://www.symantec.com/security\_response/vulnerability.jsp?bid=70332

SQL – a query language for databases

 Queries like: "SELECT grade,id FROM students WHERE name=" + username;

ID	Name	Grade
0	Alice	92
1	Bob	87
2	Mallory	75

SQL – a query language for databases

 Queries like: "SELECT grade,id FROM students WHERE name=" + username;

ID	Name	Grade
0	Alice	92
1	Bob	87
2	Mallory	75

Values for name, grade often come from user input.

SQL – a query language for databases

 Queries like: "SELECT grade,id FROM students WHERE name=" + username;

ID	Name	Grade
0	Alice	92
1	Bob	87
2	Mallory	75

Values for name, grade often come from user input.
 Why is this a problem?

username = "'bob'; DROP TABLE students"

What happens?

# **SQL Injection**

[http://xkcd.com/327/] [http://bobby-tables.com/]

The user may include commands in their input!

# SQL Injection

[http://xkcd.com/327/] [http://bobby-tables.com/]

- The user may include commands in their input!
- Need to sanitize the input before use

# **SQL** Injection

[http://xkcd.com/327/] [http://bobby-tables.com/]

- The user may include commands in their input!
- Need to sanitize the input before use

How would you prevent this problem?

The problems may be much more subtle:

User A can read files X,Y,Z and write to S,T User B can read files X,Y,S and write to Z,T

How can we ensure that no information from A is ever written to Z?

The problems may be much more subtle:

User A can read files X,Y,Z and write to S,T User B can read files X,Y,S and write to Z,T

How can we ensure that no information from A is ever written to Z?

Can you envision a scenario that creates this problem?

The problems may be much more subtle:

User A can read files X,Y,Z and write to S,T User B can read files X,Y,S and write to Z,T

How can we ensure that no information from A is ever written to Z?

Care may be required to enforce access control policies

The problems may be much more subtle:

User A can read files X,Y,Z and write to S,T User B can read files X,Y,S and write to Z,T

How can we ensure that no information from A is ever written to Z?

- Care may be required to enforce access control policies
  - Discretionary access control owner determines access

The problems may be much more subtle:

User A can read files X,Y,Z and write to S,T User B can read files X,Y,S and write to Z,T

How can we ensure that no information from A is ever written to Z?

- Care may be required to enforce access control policies
  - Discretionary access control owner determines access
  - Mandatory access control clearance determines access

- Make risky operations someone else's job
  - e.g. Google Checkout, PayPal, Amazon, etc.

- Make risky operations someone else's job
  - e.g. Google Checkout, PayPal, Amazon, etc.
- Define rigorous security policies
  - What are your CIAA security criteria?

- Make risky operations someone else's job
  - e.g. Google Checkout, PayPal, Amazon, etc.
- Define rigorous security policies
  - What are your CIAA security criteria?
- Follow secure design & coding policies
  - And include them in your review criteria

- Make risky operations someone else's job
  - e.g. Google Checkout, PayPal, Amazon, etc.
- Define rigorous security policies
  - What are your CIAA security criteria?
- Follow secure design & coding policies
  - And include them in your review criteria
  - Apple secure coding policies
  - CERT Top 10 Practices
  - Mitre Mitigation Strategies

- Make risky operations someone else's job
  - e.g. Google Checkout, PayPal, Amazon, etc.
- Define rigorous security policies
  - What are your CIAA security criteria?
- Follow secure design & coding policies
  - And include them in your review criteria
- Formal certification

- Security must be part of design
  - Prepared Statements, Safe Arrays, etc.

- Security must be part of design
  - Prepared Statements, Safe Arrays, etc.
- Regular security audits
  - Retrospective analysis & suggestions

- Security must be part of design
  - Prepared Statements, Safe Arrays, etc.
- Regular security audits
  - Retrospective analysis & suggestions
- Penetration testing
  - Can someone skilled break it?

Security is now a pressing concern for all software

- Security is now a pressing concern for all software
  - Old software was designed in an era of naiveté and is often vulnerable/broken

- Security is now a pressing concern for all software
  - Old software was designed in an era of naiveté and is often vulnerable/broken
  - New software is built to perform sensitive operations in a multiuser and networked environment.

- Security is now a pressing concern for all software
  - Old software was designed in an era of naiveté and is often vulnerable/broken
  - New software is built to perform sensitive operations in a multiuser and networked environment.

Not planning for security concerns from the beginning is a broken approach to development