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We would like to be protected from

- Fun/hack/defacing
- Tampering
- Resources stealing
- Data stealing
- Destroying
- DoS
- ...
Thus we must ensure:

- Confidentiality
- Integrity
- Availability

What do we do to ensure that?

- We define a set of rules describing the way we handle, protect and distribute information
  - This is called a security policy
To enforce our security policy, we will use some security software

- Tripwire, AIDE, for integrity checks
- SSH, SSL, IP-SEC, for confidentiality
- Passwords, secure badges, biometric access controls
- . . .

Can we trust them? Do they live in a trusted place?
The mice and the cookies

Facts:

- We have some cookies in a house
- We want to prevent the mice from eating the cookies
The mice and the cookies

Solution 1: we protect the house
  ► too many variables to cope with (lots of windows, holes, ...)
  ► we can’t know all the holes to lock them.
  ► we can’t be sure there weren’t any mice before we closed the holes
I won’t bet I’ll eat cookies tomorrow.

Solution 2: we put the cookies in a metal box
  ► we can grasp the entire problem
  ► we can “audit” the box
  ► the cookies don’t care whether mice can break into the house
I’ll bet I’ll eat cookies tomorrow.
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Kernel security model

- Hardware
- Kernel space
- User space
- Tripwire
- Sendmail
- SSH

trusted → untrusted
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Kernel security model
To use this model, we must patch the kernel for it to

- protect itself
  - trusted kernel space
- protect other programs/data related to/involved in the security policy
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- Bugless interfaces
  - network stack, kbd input, ...
  - system calls

- Defence
  - /dev/mem, /dev/kmem ...
  - create_module(), init_module(), ...

- Filtering
  - Queries to reach a storage device or PROMs, FPGAs, ...
  - Queries to reach another process’ memory
Is the bugless interface hypothesis ok?

- Protected mode mechanisms $\implies$ harder to do programming faults (IMHO) (bugs are still possible, race conditions for ex.)

```
linux/drivers/char/rtc.c

static int rtc_ioctl(struct inode *inode, struct file *file, unsigned int cmd,
                     unsigned long arg)
{
    unsigned long flags;
    struct rtc_time wtime;

    switch (cmd) {
        [...]
        case RTC_ALM_SET: /* Store a time into the alarm */
        {
            unsigned char hrs, min, sec;
            struct rtc_time alm_tm;

            if (copy_from_user(&alm_tm, (struct rtc_time*)arg,
                                sizeof(struct rtc_time)))
                return -EFAULT;
    }
```
How to protect kernel space against a user space intruder?
Block everything from user space that can affect kernel space.

- Attacks can come through:
  - system calls
  - devices files
  - procfs

- Few entry points, opened by the kernel
  - `/dev/mem, /dev/kmem`
  - `/dev/port, ioperm and iopl`
  - `create_module(), init_module(),...`
  - `reboot()`
How ? Taxonomy | Defence | Filtering

/dev/mem, /dev/kmem and /dev/port protection:

static int open_port(struct inode * inode, 
                     struct file * filp) 
{
    return capable(CAP_SYS_RAWIO) ? 0 : -EPERM;
}
Module insertion control:

```c
asmlinkage unsigned long
sys_create_module(const char *name_user, size_t size)
{
    char *name;
    long namelen, error;
    struct module *mod;

    if (!capable(CAP_SYS_MODULE))
        return -EPERM;

    [...]
```
What must we protect?

- What is in memory
  - Processes
  - Kernel configuration (firewall rules, etc.)

- What is on disks or tapes
  - Files
  - Metadata (filesystems, partition tables, ...), boot loaders, ...

- Hardware
  - EPROMs, configurable hardware, ...
How to protect that?

- Queries are done only via system calls
- System calls are a place of choice for controlling accesses
  - We have to modify their behaviour consistently to be able to enforce a complete security policy.
A good way is to use a modular architecture to control syscalls: there will be

- An enforcer component
- A decider component
  - Lots of access control policies (DAC, MAC, ACL, RBAC, IBAC, ...)

```
app  --
     |
     v
decider component
     |
     v
enforcer component
     |
syscall
```
How to add the enforcer code to the syscalls?

- Syscall interception
- Syscall modification

System call anatomy:
Syscall interception example: Medusa DS9
linux/arch/i386/kernel/entry.S

[...]

GET_CURRENT(%ebx)
cmpl $(NR_syscalls),%eax
jae badsys

#ifdef CONFIG_MEDUSA_SYSCALL
/* cannot change: eax=syscall, ebx=current */
btl %eax,med_syscall(%ebx)
jnc 1f
pushl %ebx
pushl %eax
    call SYMBOL_NAME(medusa_syscall_watch)
cmpl $1, %eax
popl %eax
popl %ebx
jc 3f
jne 2f
1:
#ifdef

testb $0x20,flags(%ebx)                 # PF_TRACESYS
jne tracesys
[...,]
- Syscall interception advantages
  - general system
  - low cost patch

- Drawbacks
  - kind of duplication of every syscall
  - need to know and interpret parameters for each different syscall
  - architecture dependent
Syscall modification example: LIDS

```
linux/fs/open.c

asmlinkage long sys_utime(char * filename, struct utimbuf * times)
{
    int error;
    struct nameidata nd;
    struct inode * inode;
    struct iattr newattrs;

    error = user_path_walk(filename, &nd);
    if (error)
        goto out;
    inode = nd.dentry->d_inode;

    error = -EROFS;
    if (IS_RDONLY(inode))
        goto dput_and_out;

    #ifdef CONFIG_LIDS
    if(lids_load && lids_local_load) {
        if ( lids_check_base(nd.dentry,LIDS_WRITE) ) {
            lids_security_alert("Try to change utime of %s",filename);
            goto dput_and_out;
        }
    }
    #endif

    /* Don’t worry, the checks are done in inode_change_ok() */
    newattrs.ia_valid = ATTR_CTIME | ATTR_MTIME | ATTR_ATIME;
    if (times) {
```
- Syscall modification advantages
  - Syscall parameters already interpreted and checked
  - Great tuning power. We can alter the part of the syscall we want.

- Drawbacks
  - Lot of the 200+ syscalls must be altered
To be out soon in the kernel: LSM

`linux/kernel/module.c`

```c
sys_create_module(const char *name_user, size_t size)
{
    char *name;
    long namelen, error;
    struct module *mod;
    unsigned long flags;

    if (!capable(CAP_SYS_MODULE))
        return -EPERM;
    lock_kernel();
    if ((namelen = get_mod_name(name_user, &name)) < 0) {
        error = namelen;
        goto err0;
    }
    if (size < sizeof(struct module)+namelen) {
        error = -EINVAL;
        goto err1;
    }
    if (find_module(name) != NULL) {
        error = -EEXIST;
        goto err1;
    }

    /* check that we have permission to do this */
    error = security_ops->module_ops->create_module(name, size);
    if (error)
        goto err1;
}
```
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Linux Intrusion Detection System

- Self-protection
- Processes protection
- Files protection
- Online administration
- Special (controversial) features
  - Dedicated mailer in the kernel
  - Kind of portscan detector in the kernel
Self-protection

- Modules insertion/deletion, /dev/mem, ..., ioperm/iopl, ... filtered

- Boot process protected
  - Can forbid the execution of non-protected programs (not flawless)

- Sealing mecanism
  - fsck or insmod can run when booting
  - no human intervention is needed to seal the protection
  - after the seal, we are in the working state. Everything is locked
Processes protection

- Rely on the Linux capabilities bounding set
  - Hardware protection
  - Processes privacy (ptrace, promiscuous mode, ... can be forbidden)
  - Network administration locked, ...
- Daemons can be made unkillable
- Processes can be made invisible
- Processes can be granted capabilities

lidsconf -A -s /usr/sbin/sshd \\
  -o CAP_NET_BIND_SERVICE 22-22 -j GRANT
Files protection

- MAC-like approach:

```
lidsadm -A -s /usr/sbin/httpd \
        -o /home/httpd -j READ
```

- Files identified by VFS device/inode ⇒ works on every fs
Online administration

- LIDS can be disabled globally
- LIDS can be reconfigured on the fly
- LIDS can be disabled only for a shell and its children
Special features

- Mailer in the kernel
  - Can make a network connection (TCP or UDP)
  - Can send a scriptable session (mail, syslog, . . .)
  - Does not rely on anything in user space

- Scan detector in the kernel
  - Kind of interrupt driven ⇒ no load at all
  - Does not need the promiscuous mode
  - Works on all interfaces at the same time
  - Detect only connect/syn scans
  - Detect only what reach the TCP or UDP stack
LIDS general architecture

- Boot stuff
  - Kernel image
    - lidsadm
  - LIDS AC data
    - init, rc, daemons
    - processes
      - syslog
    - syscalls
      - enforcer component
      - Logging stuff
        - portscan detector
      - init code
        - procfs stuff
          - AC data
          - decider component
Other projects

- LIDS
- Medusa DS9
- RSBAC
- LoMaC
- SE Linux
- ...
Linux Security Modules: to be included in 2.5

- Kernel Summit 2001: Linus decides that Linux should support security enhancements

- LSM patch is a set of hooks in the kernel syscalls
  - Linux kernel provide the enforcer component

- Modular enough for the decider component to become a LKM
That’s all folks. Thanks for your attention.

You can reach me at <phil@lids.org>

These slides are available at
http://www.lids.org/document.html