ECS 235B Module 30
Constraint-Based Availability Models

Goals

- Ensure a resource can be accessed in a timely fashion
  - Called “quality of service”
  - “Timely fashion” depends on nature of resource, the goals of using it
- Closely related to safety and liveness
  - Safety: resource does not perform correctly the functions that client is expecting
  - Liveness: resource cannot be accessed

Key Difference

- Mechanisms to support availability in general
    - Lack of availability assumes average case, follows a statistical model
- Mechanisms to support availability as security requirement
    - Lack of availability assumes worst case, adversary deliberately makes resource unavailable
    - Failures are non-random, may not conform to any useful statistical model

Deadlock

- A state in which some set of processes block each waiting for another process in set to take come action
  - *Mutual exclusion*: resource not shared
  - *Hold and wait*: process must hold resource and block, waiting other needed resources to become available
  - *No preemption*: resource being held cannot be released
  - *Circular wait*: set of entities holding resources such that each process waiting for another process in set to release resources
- Usually not due to an attack

Approaches to Solving Deadlocks

- *Prevention*: prevent 1 of the 4 conditions from holding
  - Do not acquire resources until all needed ones are available
  - When needing a new resource, release all held
- *Avoidance*: ensure process stays in state where deadlock cannot occur
  - *Safe state*: deadlock can not occur
  - *Unsafe state*: may lead to state in which deadlock can occur
- *Detection*: allow deadlocks to occur, but detect and recover

Denial of Service

- Occurs when a group of authorized users of a service make that service unavailable to a (disjoint) group of authorized users for a period of time exceeding a defined maximum waiting time
  - First "group of authorized users" here is group of users with access to service, whether or not the security policy grants them access
  - Often abbreviated "DoS" or "DOS"
- Assumes that, in the absence of other processes, there are enough resources
  - Otherwise problem is not solvable unless more resources created
  - Inadequate resources is another type of problem

Components of DoS Model

- *Waiting time policy*: controls the time between a process requesting a resource and being allocated that resource
  - Denial of service occurs when this waiting time exceeded
  - Amount of time depends on environment, goals
- *User agreement*: establishes constraints that process must meet in order to access resource
  - Here, “user” means a process
  - These ensure a process will receive service within the waiting time

Constraint-Based Model (Yu-Gligor)

- Framed in terms of users accessing a server for some services
- *User agreement*: describes properties that users of servers must meet
- *Finite waiting time policy*: ensures no user is excluded from using resource

User Agreement

- Set of constraints designed to prevent denial of service
- S_{seq} sequence of all possible invocations of a service
- U_{seq} set of sequences of all possible invocations by a user
- $U_{Ii,seq} \subseteq U_{seq}$ that user U_i can invoke
  - C set of operations U_i can perform to consume service
  - P set of operations to produce service user U_i consumes
  - $p < c$ means operation $p \in P$ must precede operation $c \in C$
  - A_i set of operations allowed for user U_i
  - R_i set of relations between every pair of allowed operations for U_i

Example

Mutually exclusive resource

- C = { *acquire* }
- P = { *release* }
- For p_1, p_2, A_i = { $acquire_i$, $release_i$ } for i = 1, 2
- For p_1, p_2, R_i = { ($acquire_i < release_i$) } for i = 1, 2

Sequences of Operations

- $U_i(k)$ initial subsequence of U_i of length k
  - $n_o(U_i(k))$ number of times operation o occurs in $U_i(k)$
- $U_i(k)$ safe if the following 2 conditions hold:
  - if $o \in U_{i,seq}$, then $o \in A_i$; and
    - That is, if U_i executes o, it must be an allowed operation for U_i
  - for all k, if $(o < o') \in R_i$, then $n_o(U_i(k)) \geq n_{o'}(U_i(k))$
    - That is, if one operation precedes another, the first one must occur more times than the second

Resources of Services

- $s \in S_{seq}$ possible sequence of invocations of services
- s blocks on condition c
  - May be waiting for service to become available, or processing some response, etc.
- $o_i^*(c)$ represents operation o_i blocked, waiting for c to become true
  - When execution results, $o_i(c)$ represents operation
  - Note that when c becomes true, $o_i^*(c)$ may not resume immediately

Resources of Services

- $s(0)$ initial subsequence of s up to operation $o_i^*(c)$
- $s(k)$ subsequence of operations between $(k\text{-}1)^{st}$, k^{th} time c becomes true after $o_i^*(c)$
- $o_i^*(c) \rightarrow^{s(k)} o_i(c)$: o_i blocks waiting on c at end of $s(0)$, resumes operation at end of $s(k)$
- S_{seq} *live* if for every $o_i^*(c)$ there is a set of subsequences $s(0), ..., s(k)$ such that it is initial subsequence of some $s \in S_{seq}$ and $o_i^*(c) \rightarrow^{s(k)} o_i(c)$

Example

- Mutually exclusive resource; consider sequence

  $$(\mathit{acquire}_i, \mathit{release}_i, \mathit{acquire}_i, \mathit{acquire}_i, \mathit{release}_i)$$

  with $\mathit{acquire}_i$, $\mathit{release}_i \in A_i$, $(\mathit{acquire}_i, \mathit{release}_i) \in R_i$; $o = \mathit{acquire}_i$, $o' = \mathit{release}_i$
- $U_i(1) = (\mathit{acquire}_i\ ) \Rightarrow n_o(U_i(1)) = 1, n_{o'}(U_i(1)) = 0$
- $U_i(2) = (\mathit{acquire}_i, \mathit{release}_i\ ) \Rightarrow n_o(U_i(2)) = 1, n_{o'}(U_i(2)) = 1$
- $U_i(3) = (\mathit{acquire}_i, \mathit{release}_i, \mathit{acquire}_i) \Rightarrow n_o(U_i(3)) = 2, n_{o'}(U_i(3)) = 1$
- $U_i(4) = (\mathit{acquire}_i, \mathit{release}_i, \mathit{acquire}_i, \mathit{acquire}_i) \Rightarrow n_o(U_i(4)) = 3, n_{o'}(U_i(4)) = 1$
- $U_i(5) = (\mathit{acquire}_i, \mathit{release}_i, \mathit{acquire}_i, \mathit{acquire}_i, \mathit{release}_i) \Rightarrow$

  $n_o(U_i(5)) = 3, n_{o'}(U_i(5)) = 2$
- As $n_o(U_i(k)) \geq n_{o'}(U_i(k))$ for $k = 1, ..., 5$, the sequence is safe

Example (*con't*)

- Let c be true whenever resource can be released
  - That is, initially and whenever a $release_i$ operation is performed
- Consider sequence: ($acquire_1$, $acquire_2^*(c)$, $release_1$, $release_2$, ... , $acquire_k$, $acquire_{k+1}(c)$, $release_k$, $release_{k+1}$, ...)
- For all $k \geq 1$, $acquire_i{}^*(c) \rightarrow^{s(1)} acquire_{k+1}(c)$, so this is live sequence
  - Here, $acquire_{k+1}(c)$ occurs between $release_k$ and $release_{k+1}$

Expressing User Agreements

- Use temporal logics
- Symbols
  - $\square$: henceforth (the predicate is true and will remain true)
  - $\diamond$: eventually (the predicate is either true now, or will become true in the future)
  - $\leadsto$: will lead to (if the first part is true, the second part will eventually become true); so $A \leadsto B$ is shorthand for $A \Rightarrow \diamond B$

Example

- Acquiring and releasing mutually exclusive resource type
- User agreement: once a process is blocked on an *acquire* operation, enough *release* operations will release enough resources of that type to allow blocked process to proceed

service resource_allocator

User agreement

$$in(acquire) \rightsquigarrow ((\Box\Diamond(\#active\_release > 0) \lor (free \geq acquire.n))$$

- When a process issues an *acquire* request, at some later time at least 1 *release* operation occurs, and enough resources will be freed for the requesting process to acquire the needed resources

Finite Waiting Time Policy

- *Fairness policy*: prevents starvation; ensures process using a resource will not block indefinitely if given the opportunity to progress
- *Simultaneity policy*: ensures progress; provides opportunities process needs to use resource
- *User agreement*: see earlier
- If these three hold, no process will wait an indefinite time before accessing and using the resource

Example

- Continuing example ... these and above user agreement ensure no indefinite blocking

sharing policies

fairness

$(at(acquire) \land \Box\Diamond((free \geq acquire.n) \land (\#active = 0))) \rightsquigarrow after(acquire)$

$(at(release) \land \Box\Diamond(\#active = 0)) \rightsquigarrow after(release)$

simultaneity

$(in(acquire) \land (\Box\Diamond(free \geq acquire.n)) \land (\Box\Diamond(\#active = 0))) \rightsquigarrow$

$((free \geq acquire.n) \land (\#active = 0))$

$(in(release) \land \Box\Diamond(\#active\_release > 0)) \rightsquigarrow (free \geq acquire.n)$

Service Specification

- Interface operations
- Private operations not available outside service
- Resource constraints
- Concurrency constraints
- Finite waiting time policy

Example:

- Interface operations of the resource allocation/deallocation example

interface operations

acquire(n: *units*)

exception conditions: $quota[id] < own[id] + n$

effects: $free' = free - n$

$own[id]' = own[id] + n$

release(n: *units*)

exception conditions: $n > own[id]$

effects: $free' = free + n$

$own[id]' = own[id] - n$

Example (*con't*)

Resource constrains of the resource allocation/deallocation example

resource constraints

1. $\square((free \geq 0) \land (free \leq size))$
2. $(\forall\ id)\ [\square(own[id] \geq 0) \land (own[id] \leq quota[id]))]$
3. $(free = N) \Rightarrow ((free = N)$ UNTIL $(after(acquire) \lor after(release)))$
4. $(\forall\ id)\ [\ (own[id] = M) \Rightarrow ((own[id] = M)$ UNTIL $(after(acquire) \lor after(release)))]$

Example (*con't*)

Concurrency constraints of the resource allocation/deallocation example

concurrency constraints

1. $\square(\#\mathit{active} \leq 1)$
2. $(\#\mathit{active} = 1) \leadsto (\#\mathit{active} = 1)$

Denial of Service

- Service specification policies, user agreements prevent denial of service *if enforced*
- These do *not* prevent a long wait time; they simply ensure the wait time is finite

Quiz

A process waits for 10 hours to access a resource. Is this a denial of service attack?

- No, as the process got the resource
- It depends on the policy describing the service expected
- Yes, as the fairness constraint was not satisfied because of the long wait