Access Control PA193 Secure Coding Principles

Vladimír Štill based on materials by Petr Ročkai

Faculty of Informatics, Masaryk University

Access control in …

- 1 Multi-User Systems
- 2 File Systems
- **3** Sub-User Granularity

(example functions/API given for POSIX)

[Multi-User Systems](#page-2-0)

- computer can be expensive \rightarrow share it by multiple people
- not everyone should have access to everything
- privileges separation is needed
	- \blacksquare private files
	- **n** computer administration
- $\blacksquare \rightarrow$ computer *users* with permissions
	- \blacksquare can be people
	- or services
	- managed by operating system

Ownership

```
u various objects in an OS can be owned
     files
     processes
     …
u usually: owner = creator
     ownership can be transferred
        by system the administrator and possibly original owner
     \overline{\phantom{a}}\blacksquare API
     processes: ps, getuid()/geteuid(), ...
     \blacksquare files: 1s, stat, stat(), ...
```
 \blacksquare entities should have minimum privilege required \blacksquare applies to software components (service users) but also to human users of the system m. \blacksquare e.g. the user cannot install applications system-wide \blacksquare this limits the scope of mistakes and also of security compromises m.

Privilege Separation

 \blacksquare different parts of a system need different privilege least privilege \rightarrow splitting the system **n** components are *isolated* from each other \blacksquare they are given only the rights they need components communicate using simple IPC

```
$ ps axo user,group,comm
nginx nginx nginx
postgres postgres postgres
xstill fi-stud+ bash
checker checker python3
fjaweb nginx uwsgi
\lceil \dots \rceil
```
each process runs in its own address space shared memory can be requested \blacksquare each user has a view of the filesystem \blacksquare a lot more is shared by default in the filesystem **E** especially the namespace (directory hierarchy)

owner usually decide who can access their objects \blacksquare = discretionary access control \blacksquare in high-security environments, this is not allowed \blacksquare a central authority decides the policy \blacksquare = mandatory access control

Access Control Policy

there are 3 pieces of information **the subject (user)** \blacksquare the verb (what is to be done) \blacksquare the *object* (the file or other resource) \blacksquare in a typical OS those are (possibly virtual) users sub-user units are possible (e.g. programs) \blacksquare roles and groups could also be subjects \blacksquare the subject must be named (names, identifiers) easy on a single system, hard in a network

- \blacksquare the available "verbs" (actions) depend on object type a typical object would be a file $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$
	- \blacksquare files can be read, written, executed
	- **directories can be searched or listed or changed**
- network connections can be established, …

 \blacksquare anything that can be manipulated by programs **a** although not everything is subject to access control \blacksquare files, directories, sockets, shared memory, ... object names depend on their type ■ file paths, i-node numbers, IP addresses, ...

```
\blacksquare there are 2 types of subjects: users and groups
  each user can belong to multiple groups (one is primary)
  users are split into normal users and root
       root = super-user
$ id
uid=22572(xstill) gid=985(users)
```

```
groups=985(users),984(systemd-journal),998(wheel)
```

```
getuid(), getgrid(), getgroups()(geteuid(), getegid())
```
User Management

- \blacksquare the system needs a database of users
- \blacksquare in a network, user identities often need to be shared simple – text file
- **F** /etc/passwd and /etc/group on UNIX systems \Box complex – a distributed database
- \blacksquare FI uses LDAP + Kerberos for user database and authentication

```
aisa$ getent passwd xstill xsvenda
xstill:x:22572:10100:Vladimir Still:/home/xstill:/bin/bash
xsvenda:x:10361:10000:Petr Svenda:/home/xsvenda:/bin/bash
```

```
aisa$ getent group paradise
paradise:*:10240:xsafran1,brim,xbenes3,cerna,xbarnat
```
users and groups are represented as numbers \blacksquare this improves efficiency of many operations \blacksquare the numbers are called uid and gid \blacksquare those numbers are valid on a single computer or at most, a local network (e.g. FI network)

- each process belongs to a particular user
- ownership is inherited across fork()
- super-user processes can use setuid() to change user ID
- exec() can sometimes change a process owner
	- setuid binaries (like sudo)
- a super-user process manages user logins
- the user types their name and provides credentials **COL**
	- upon successful authentication, login process calls fork()
	- \blacksquare the child calls setuid() to the user
	- and uses $exec()$ to start a shell for the user

the user needs to authenticate themselves passwords are the most commonly used method \blacksquare the system needs to know the right password user should be able to change their password m. biometric methods are also quite popular

- passwords are often stored as hashes
- along with salt, to counter rainbow tables
- on UNIX: /etc/shadow (only root can read)
	- also: key derivation functions (bcrypt, argon2)
- **r** remote login authentication over network is more complicated
	- e.g. Kerberos, authentication against a trusted third party
	- passwords are easiest, but not easy $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}}$
	- encryption is needed to safely transmit passwords
	- computer authentication
	- \blacksquare 2-factor authentication is a popular improvement

how to ensure we send the password to the right party? an attacker could *impersonate* our remote computer usually via *asymmetric cryptography* **a** a private key can be used to sign messages \blacksquare the server will sign a message establishing its identity

■ 2 different types of authentication **harder to spoof both at the same time** \blacksquare there are a few factors to pick from something the user knows (password) something the user has (keys) what the user is (biometric) m.

 \blacksquare all enforcement begins with the hardware ■ the CPU provides a *privileged mode* for the kernel ■ DMA memory and IO instructions are protected, ... \blacksquare the MMU allows the kernel to isolate processes \blacksquare and protect its own integrity different address spaces for different processes \blacksquare there can be security bugs in hardware (e.g. [Meltdown,](https://meltdownattack.com) [Spectre\)](https://meltdownattack.com)

 \blacksquare kernel uses hardware facilities to implement security \blacksquare it stands between resources and processes access is mediated through system calls file systems are part of the kernel user and group abstractions are part of the kernel

- the kernel acts as an arbitrator
- a process is trapped in its own address space
- processes use system calls to access resources
	- \blacksquare kernel can decide what to allow
	- **based on its access control model and policy**

userland processes can enforce access control **usually system services which provide IPC API e.g.** via the getpeereid() system call **the caller which user is connected to a socket** user-level access control is rooted in kernel facilities **COL**

[File Systems](#page-25-0)

file systems are a case study in access control all modern file systems maintain permissions **the only exception in use is FAT (USB sticks, UEFI boot)** different systems adopt different representation

file systems are usually object-centric permissions are attached to individual objects **E** easily answers "who can access this file"? **there is a fixed set of verbs** \blacksquare those may be different for files and directories different systems allow different verbs **The State**

- each file and directory has a single owner $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}}$
- plus a single owning group $\overline{\mathbb{R}^n}$
	- not limited to those the owner belongs to
- ownership and permissions are attached to i-nodes, not to paths

POSIX ties ownership and access rights **The Second** only 3 subjects can be named on a file \blacksquare the owner (user) \blacksquare the owning group **e** everyone else ("other users")

Access Verbs in POSIX File Systems

read: read a file, list a directory write: write a file, $link/unlink$ i-nodes to a directory $\blacksquare \rightarrow$ you don't need file access to delete it **E** execute: exec a program, enter the directory execute as owner (group): setuid/setgid

Permission Bits

basic UNIX permissions can be encoded in 9 bits **3** bits per 3 subject designations **First comes the owner, then group, then others** written as e.g. $rwxr-x--$ or 0750 (octal) \blacksquare plus two numbers for the owner/group identifiers plus setuid/setgid, and sticky bit for directories

```
$ 1s -1-rw-r--r-- 1 xstill users 250 Mar 19 16:19 Makefile
-rw-r--r-- 1 xstill users 18887 Mar 24 13:25 access-control.md
drwxr-xr-x 5 xstill users 124 Mar 19 11:01 texstyle
$ stat access-control.md
\lceil \cdot \cdot \rceilAccess: (0644/-rw-r--r--) Uid: (22572/xstill) Gid: (985/users)
```

```
\blacksquare stat()
```
on Linux root can change file owners

- \blacksquare owner can change only group, to some group they belong to
- chown and chgrp system utilities
- **n** or via the C API
	- chown(), fchown(), fchownat(), lchown()
	- same set for chgrp

a available to the owner and to root

n chmod user space utility

either numeric argument: chmod 644 file.txt or symbolic: chmod +x script.sh, chmod $u+x$, $g-w$, $g+r$, $o = -$...

n and the corresponding system call (numeric, macros)

```
// rwxrwxr-x
chmod("script.sh",
      S IRWXU | S IRWXG | S IROTH | S IXOTH);
```
- special permissions on executable files
- \blacksquare they allow exec to also change the process owner
- often used for granting extra privileges
	- \blacksquare e.g. the mount and sudo commands run as the super-user
	- **significantly increases safety requirements of the program**

file creation and deletion is a directory permission \blacksquare this is problematic for shared directories in particular the system /tmp directory m. \blacksquare in a sticky directory, different rules apply new files can be created as usual only the owner can unlink a file from the directory **The State**

ACL is a list of ACE's (access control elements) each ACE is a subject $+$ verb pair \blacksquare it can name an arbitrary user ACL is attached to an object (file, directory)

more flexible than the traditional UNIX system

ACLs and POSIX

part of POSIX.1e (security extensions) **The Second**

- most POSIX systems implement ACLs
	- this does not supersede UNIX permission bits
	- instead, they are interpreted as part of the ACL
- **specific permissions for given user/group**
	- \blacksquare + default permissions for newly created entities in directory
	- $-$ + mask

```
file system support is not universal (but widespread)
```
Ext $2/3/4$, XFS, Btrfs, ...

setfacl/getfacl utilities, $\langle sys/ac$ l.h> header (libacl)

```
setfacl -m u:xstill:rw file.txt
```

```
setfacl -m g:pa193:r file.txt
```
UNIX represents devices as special i-nodes **The Second n** this makes them subject to normal access control usually under /dev \blacksquare the particular device is described in the i-node only a super-user can create device nodes users could otherwise gain access to any device

named sockets and pipes are just i-nodes \blacksquare also subject to standard file permissions especially useful with sockets \blacksquare a service sets up a named socket in the file system \blacksquare file permissions decide who can talk to the service **E.g.** local communication with database

Special Attributes

flags that allow additional restrictions on file use **E** e.g. immutable files (cannot be changed by anyone) **a** append-only files (for logfile integrity protection) compression, copy-on-write controls non-standard (Linux lsattr/chattr, BSD chflags) depends on filesystem too (man xfs, man ext4, …)

```
$ touch file.txt
$ sudo chattr +a file.txt
$ lsattr file.txt
-----a---------------- file.txt
$ echo append_is_ok >> file.txt
$ echo rewrite is forbidden > file.txt
bash: file.txt: Operation not permitted
```
- different computers can have different user maps
- NFS 3.0 simply transmits numeric uid and gid
	- \blacksquare the numbering needs to be synchronised
	- can be done via a central user database
	- a machine that is allowed to mount shares must be trusted
- NFS 4.0 uses per-user authentication
	- \blacksquare the user can authenticate to the server directly using Kerberos
	- **Filesystem uid and gid values are mapped**

File System Quotas

storage space is limited, shared by users

- \blacksquare files take up storage space
- \blacksquare file ownership is also a liability
- quotas set up limits space use by users
	- \blacksquare exhausted quota can lead to denial of access
- depends on filesystem

```
aisa$ quota \negvs
[…]
home.fi.muni.cz:/export/home/[…]
17689M 19532M 24415M 386k 600k 700k
home.fi.muni.cz:/export/usrdata/[…]
25004M 97657M 144G 501k 600k 700k
```
a access control at file system level makes little sense other computers may choose to ignore permissions user names or id's would not make sense anyway option 1: encryption (for denying reads) option 2: hardware-level controls **u** usually read-only vs read-write on the entire medium each process in UNIX has its own root directory \blacksquare for most, this coincides with the system root \blacksquare the root directory can be changed using chroot() \blacksquare can be useful to limit file system access e.g. in privilege separation scenarios

n chroot alone is *not* a security mechanism \mathbf{r} a super-user process can get out easily but not easy for a normal user process \mathbf{r} also useful for diagnostic purposes and as lightweight alternative to virtualisation or when repairing a system (live $\text{USB} + \text{chroot}$)

[Sub-User Granularity](#page-46-0)

users are not always the right abstraction **n** creating users is relatively expensive only a super-user can create new users **College** vou may want to include programs as subjects \blacksquare or rather, the combination user $+$ program

users have user names, but how about programs? option 1: cryptographic signatures portable across computers but complex **Exercise** is establishes identity based on the program itself option 2: *i-node of the executable* simple, local, identity based on *location*

program: passive (file) vs active (processes) only a process can be a subject \blacksquare but program identity is attached to the file rights of a process depend on its program \blacksquare exec() will change privileges

delegates permission control to a central authority often coupled with security labels classifies subjects (users, processes) and also objects (files, sockets, programs) m. \blacksquare the owner cannot change object permissions

- **1** simple security property
	- **vou can't read what is beyond your clearance**
- 2 the star property
	- also called no write down
	- **v** you cannot write to 'more public' files
- not all verbs (actions) need to take objects
- e.g. shutting down the computer (there is only one)
- mounting file systems (they can't be always named)
- listening on ports with number less than 1024

Dismantling the root User

 \blacksquare the traditional root user is all-powerful

- \blacksquare "all or nothing" is often unsatisfactory
- \blacksquare violates the principle of least privilege
- many special properties of root are capabilities
	- \blacksquare root then becomes the user with all capabilities
	- other users can get selective privileges
- some of these privileges can be granted using setuid bit and/or groups
	- mounting selected mounts defined in /etc/fstab
	- viewing system logs
	- shutdown, suspend

Linux Capabilities

man capabilities, man libcap (<sys/capability.h>)

can replace setuid – binaries can be assigned capabilities to grant them some super-user abilities

n capabilities on files

needs filesystem support (widespread) m.

- **n** can be also set from (more privileged) process; by systemd
- **E** capability bounding set limits what capabilities can be get by exec*()

lower security risk

but many capabilities actually enable root access E.g. CAP_CHOWN (change file owner), CAP_NET_ADMIN (network, firewall, routing, …), CAP_NET_RAW (raw sockets), CAP_SYS_CHROOT, CAP_SYS_NICE ■ getcap, setcap, capsh, setpriv, ...

security hinges on what is allowed to execute **The Second** arbitrary code execution are the worst exploits $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}}$ **this allows unauthorized execution of code** \blacksquare same effect as impersonating the user almost as bad as stolen credentials **COL**

P programs often process data from dubious sources think image viewers, audio & video players \blacksquare archive extraction, font rendering, ... **bugs in programs can be exploited** \blacksquare the program can be tricked into executing data

some privileges can be tied to a particular process \blacksquare those only apply during the lifetime of the process \blacksquare often restrictions rather than privileges \blacksquare this is how privilege dropping is done **processes are identified using their numeric pid** restrictions are inherited across fork()

tries to limit damage from code execution exploits \blacksquare the program *drops all privileges* it can \blacksquare this is done before it touches any of the input \blacksquare the attacker is stuck with the reduced privileges \blacksquare this can often prevent a successful attack

traditionally, you would only execute trusted code usually based on reputation or other external factors \blacksquare this does not scale to a large number of vendors \blacksquare it is common to execute untrusted, even dubious code \blacksquare this can be okay with sufficient sandboxing

- applications from a store are semi-trusted
- **typically single-user computers/devices**
- permissions are attached to apps instead of users
- partially virtual users, partially API-level