

# A Model for Securing Application Chains in a Cloud

Donghoon Kim and Mladen A. Vouk {dkim2, vouk}@ncsu.edu

# Goals & Assumptions

Explore a model for securing software application chains in a cloud. Applications chains are controlled by a workflow engine.

- Assumption1: Individual software application chain elements are reliable and secure under normal operational profile.
- Assumption2: Attacks are based primarily on nonoperational profiles
- Assumption3: Assuring normal operational profile (OP) by securing access and individual input/output data (flow) integrity ensures security.

Let n-tuple *WM* =<*F*, *O*, *C*, *SP*, *SC* > describe the workflow and its security properties

- *F* : a set of operations (functions, processes, transformations),
  e.g.,{*f*<sub>1</sub>, *f*<sub>2</sub>, …, *f*<sub>n</sub>}
- O: objects; data, data objects and flows
- C : connectivity matrix for directed graphs describing the workflow,

loops are allowed, loop stopping criteria are in the transformation node f .

- SP : security property, e.g., {Input, Remote, Data}
  - (1) Input validation
  - (2) Remote access validation, security attestation, remote input/out
- (3) Data integrity
- SC : security class, e.g., {Secure, Insecure}, but could be

## Approach

- A software application chain is represented by a directed graph on a data-flow control plane
- A simple serial (sequential) workflow example

$$x_1 \xrightarrow{f_1} y_1(=x_2) \xrightarrow{f_2} y_2...(=x_{n-1}) \xrightarrow{f_{n-1}} y_{n-1}(=x_n) \xrightarrow{f_n} y_n$$

- $x_1$ : 1<sup>st</sup> input,  $y_n$ : the final output
- Every  $x_i$  (i.e., i = 1, ..., n),  $x_i \in OP_i$
- OP<sub>i</sub> is the "security safe" operational profile of f<sub>i</sub>
  i.e., a set of expected inputs into component f<sub>i</sub>
- $x_n$  and  $y_n$  should be verified



- Each application (workflow/chain component) may have elements:
- COMP (Computation), Process, COMM (Communication), Input (Dataflow input), Output (Dataflow output)

multilevel - e.g., Top Secret, Secret, Insecure.

# Case Study

#### Workflow validation

 A security assessment of dataflows with Kepler sample workflow



Security checking based on n-tuple

	Input	Remote	Data	3 bit	$\oplus$	Secure
$f_1$	1	0	0	100	0	100
$f_2$	0	1	0	010	0	010
$f_3$	0	0	0	000	0	000
$f_4$	0	0	0	000	0	000
$f_5$	0	0	0	000	0	000
$f_6$	1	0	1	101	0	101
$f_7$	0	0	0	000	0	000



- Fundamental validation process for a dataflow model
  - Provenance data and security analysis of provenance data validates process and OP
  - For example: input validation may be done using whitelist, blacklist, regular expressions, etc.

## Discussion

- The proposed model provides an overall framework for securing software application chains
- This approach assumes that (1) attacks are limited to abnormal data chains on Input, remote access, and output channels (or flows).
- Idea is to limit I/O interactions to normal operational profile and validate the flows using operational profile or certification based signals
- Model may be a good way of protecting from zeroday attacks. For example, deserialization vulnerability:
  - "WebLogic Server component allows remote attackers to execute arbitrary commands via a crafted serialized Java object."

# http://silver.web.unc.edu

## Cloud Security Horizons Summit, March 2016