

CS 591: Introduction to Computer Security

Lecture 4: Bell LaPadula

James Hook

Objectives

- Introduce the Bell LaPadula framework for confidentiality policy
- Discuss realizations of Bell LaPadula

Follow Bishop

- Presentation follows Bishop's slides for Chapter 5

Discussion

- When would you choose to apply a model this restrictive?

Further Reading

- Ross Anderson's *Security Engineering*, Chapter 7: Multilevel security
 - Standard Criticisms
 - Alternative formulations
 - Several more examples
- "Looking Back at the Bell - La Padula Model", David Elliott Bell, *Proceedings 21st Annual Computer Security Applications Conference*, December, 2005
 - <http://www.acsac.org/2005/papers/Bell.pdf>

Criticisms of Bell LaPadula

- BLP is straightforward, supports formal analysis
- Is it enough?
- McLean wrote a critical paper asserting BLP rules were insufficient

McLean's System Z

- Proposed System Z = BLP + (request for downgrade)
- User L gets file H by first requesting that H be downgraded to L and then doing a legal BLP read
- Proposed fix: tranquility
 - Strong: Labels never change during operation
 - Weak: Labels never change in a manner that would violate a defined policy

Historical

- The BLP retrospective published in December is fascinating!
- What we know as BLP and “simple security” was the “trivial case” when labels didn’t change.
- Bell and La Padula expected to do a more dynamic policy

Alternatives

- Goguen & Meseguer, 1982: Noninterference
 - Model computation as event systems
 - Interleaved or concurrent computation can produce interleaved traces
 - High actions have no effect on low actions
 - The trace of a “low trace” of a system is the same for all “high processes” that are added to the mix
 - Problem: Needs deterministic traces; does not scale to distributed systems

Nondeducibility

- Sutherland, 1986.
 - Low can not deduce anything about high with 100% certainty
 - Historically important, hopelessly weak
 - Addressed issue of nondeterminism in distributed systems

Intransitive non-interference

- Rushby, 1992
 - Updates Goguen & Mesequer to deal with the reality that some communication may be authorized (e.g. High can interfere with low if it is mediated by crypto)

Looking forward

- Chapter 6: Integrity Policies