Clinical Information Systems Security Policy

- Intended for medical records
  - Conflict of interest not critical problem
  - Patient confidentiality, authentication of records and annotators, and integrity are
- Entities:
  - Patient: subject of medical records (or agent)
  - Personal health information: data about patient’s health or treatment enabling identification of patient
  - Clinician: health-care professional with access to personal health information while doing job
Assumptions and Principles

• Assumes health information involves 1 person at a time
  – Not always true; OB/GYN involves father as well as mother
• Principles derived from medical ethics of various societies, and from practicing clinicians

Access

• Principle 1: Each medical record has an access control list naming the individuals or groups who may read and append information to the record. The system must restrict access to those identified on the access control list.
  – Idea is that clinicians need access, but no-one else. Auditors get access to copies, so they cannot alter records
Access

• Principle 2: One of the clinicians on the access control list must have the right to add other clinicians to the access control list.
  – Called the *responsible clinician*

Access

• Principle 3: The responsible clinician must notify the patient of the names on the access control list whenever the patient’s medical record is opened. Except for situations given in statutes, or in cases of emergency, the responsible clinician must obtain the patient’s consent.
  – Patient must consent to all treatment, and must know of violations of security
Access

• Principle 4: The name of the clinician, the date, and the time of the access of a medical record must be recorded. Similar information must be kept for deletions.
  – This is for auditing. Don’t delete information; update it (last part is for deletion of records after death, for example, or deletion of information when required by statute). Record information about all accesses.

Creation

• Principle: A clinician may open a record, with the clinician and the patient on the access control list. If a record is opened as a result of a referral, the referring clinician may also be on the access control list.
  – Creating clinician needs access, and patient should get it. If created from a referral, referring clinician needs access to get results of referral.
Deletion

• Principle: Clinical information cannot be deleted from a medical record until the appropriate time has passed.
  – This varies with circumstances.

Confinement

• Principle: Information from one medical record may be appended to a different medical record if and only if the access control list of the second record is a subset of the access control list of the first.
  – This keeps information from leaking to unauthorized users. All users have to be on the access control list.
Aggregation

- Principle: Measures for preventing aggregation of patient data must be effective. In particular, a patient must be notified if anyone is to be added to the access control list for the patient’s record and if that person has access to a large number of medical records.
  - Fear here is that a corrupt investigator may obtain access to a large number of records, correlate them, and discover private information about individuals which can then be used for nefarious purposes (such as blackmail)

Enforcement

- Principle: Any computer system that handles medical records must have a subsystem that enforces the preceding principles. The effectiveness of this enforcement must be subject to evaluation by independent auditors.
  - This policy has to be enforced, and the enforcement mechanisms must be auditable (and audited)
Compare to Bell-LaPadula

- Confinement Principle imposes lattice structure on entities in model
  - Similar to Bell-LaPadula
- CISS focuses on objects being accessed; B-LP on the subjects accessing the objects
  - May matter when looking for insiders in the medical environment

Compare to Clark-Wilson

- CDIs are medical records
- TPs are functions updating records, access control lists
- IVPs certify:
  - A person identified as a clinician is a clinician;
  - A clinician validates, or has validated, information in the medical record;
  - When someone is to be notified of an event, such notification occurs; and
  - When someone must give consent, the operation cannot proceed until the consent is obtained
- Auditing (CR4) requirement: make all records append-only, notify patient when access control list changed
ORCON

• Problem: organization creating document wants to control its dissemination
  – Example: Secretary of Agriculture writes a memo for distribution to her immediate subordinates, and she must give permission for it to be disseminated further. This is “originator controlled” (here, the “originator” is a person).

Requirements

• Subject $s \in S$ marks object $o \in O$ as ORCON on behalf of organization $X$. $X$ allows $o$ to be disclosed to subjects acting on behalf of organization $Y$ with the following restrictions:
  1. $o$ cannot be released to subjects acting on behalf of other organizations without $X$’s permission; and
  2. Any copies of $o$ must have the same restrictions placed on it.
DAC Fails

- Owner can set any desired permissions
  - This makes 2 unenforceable

MAC Fails

- First problem: category explosion
  - Category C contains o, X, Y, and nothing else. If a subject y ∈ Y wants to read o, x ∈ X makes a copy o'. Note o' has category C. If y wants to give z ∈ Z a copy, z must be in Y—by definition, it's not. If x wants to let w ∈ W see the document, need a new category C' containing o, X, W.

- Second problem: abstraction
  - MAC classification, categories centrally controlled, and access controlled by a centralized policy
  - ORCON controlled locally
Combine Them

• The owner of an object cannot change the access controls of the object.
• When an object is copied, the access control restrictions of that source are copied and bound to the target of the copy.
  – These are MAC (owner can’t control them)
• The creator (originator) can alter the access control restrictions on a per-subject and per-object basis.
  – This is DAC (owner can control it)

RBAC

• Access depends on function, not identity
  – Example:
    • Allison, bookkeeper for Math Dept, has access to financial records.
    • She leaves.
    • Betty hired as the new bookkeeper, so she now has access to those records
  – The role of “bookkeeper” dictates access, not the identity of the individual.
Definitions

• Role $r$: collection of job functions
  – $\text{trans}(r)$: set of authorized transactions for $r$
• Active role of subject $s$: role $s$ is currently in
  – $\text{actr}(s)$
• Authorized roles of a subject $s$: set of roles $s$ is authorized to assume
  – $\text{authr}(s)$
• $\text{canexec}(s, t)$ iff subject $s$ can execute transaction $t$ at current time

Axioms

• Let $S$ be the set of subjects and $T$ the set of transactions.
• Rule of role assignment: $(\forall s \in S)(\forall t \in T) [\text{canexec}(s, t) \rightarrow \text{actr}(s) \neq \emptyset]$.
  – If $s$ can execute a transaction, it has a role
  – This ties transactions to roles
• Rule of role authorization: $(\forall s \in S) [\text{actr}(s) \subseteq \text{authr}(s)]$.
  – Subject must be authorized to assume an active role
    (otherwise, any subject could assume any role)
Axiom

• Rule of transaction authorization: 
  \[(\forall s \in S)(\forall t \in T)\]
  \[\text{canexec}(s, t) \rightarrow t \in \text{trans}(\text{actr}(s))].\]
  – If a subject s can execute a transaction, 
  then the transaction is an authorized one 
  for the role s has assumed

Containment of Roles

• Trainer can do all transactions that 
  trainee can do (and then some). This 
  means role r contains role r’ (r > r’). So: 
  \[(\forall s \in S)[ r' \in \text{authr}(s) \land r > r' \rightarrow r \in \text{authr}(s) ]\]
Separation of Duty

• Let \( r \) be a role, and let \( s \) be a subject such that \( r \in auth(s) \). Then the predicate \( meauth(r) \) (for mutually exclusive authorizations) is the set of roles that \( s \) cannot assume because of the separation of duty requirement.

• Separation of duty:
  \[
  (\forall r_1, r_2 \in R) [ r_2 \in meauth(r_1) \rightarrow
  [ (\forall s \in S) [ r_1 \in authr(s) \rightarrow r_2 \notin authr(s) ] ] ]
  \]

Composition of Policies

• Two organizations have two security policies
• They merge
  – How do they combine security policies to create one security policy?
  – Can they create a coherent, consistent security policy?
The Problem

• Single system with 2 users
  – Each has own virtual machine
  – Holly at system high, Lara at system low so they cannot communicate directly
• CPU shared between VMs based on load
  – Forms a *covert channel* through which Holly, Lara can communicate

Example Protocol

• Holly, Lara agree:
  – Begin at noon
  – Lara will sample CPU utilization every minute
  – To send 1 bit, Holly runs program
    • Raises CPU utilization to over 60%
  – To send 0 bit, Holly does not run program
    • CPU utilization will be under 40%
• Not “writing” in traditional sense
  – But information flows from Holly to Lara
Policy vs. Mechanism

- Can be hard to separate these
- In the abstract: CPU forms channel along which information can be transmitted
  - Violates *-property
  - Not “writing” in traditional sense
- Conclusions:
  - Model does not give sufficient conditions to prevent communication, or
  - System is improperly abstracted; need a better definition of “writing”

Composition of Bell-LaPadula

- Why?
  - Some standards require secure components to be connected to form secure (distributed, networked) system
- Question
  - Under what conditions is this secure?
- Assumptions
  - Implementation of systems precise with respect to each system’s security policy
Issues

• Compose the lattices
• What is relationship among labels?
  – If the same, trivial
  – If different, new lattice must reflect the relationships among the levels

Example

\[
\begin{align*}
(HIGH, \{EAST, WEST\}) & \quad (HIGH, \{EAST\}) & \quad (HIGH, \{WEST\}) \\
\quad & \quad (HIGH, \{EAST\}) & \quad (HIGH, \{WEST\}) \\
\quad & \quad (TS, \{EAST\}) & \quad (TS, \{SOUTH\}) \\
\quad & \quad (S, \{EAST, SOUTH\}) & \quad (S, \{SOUTH\}) \\
\quad & \quad (S, \{EAST\}) & \quad (S, \{SOUTH\}) \\
\quad & \quad LOW & \quad LOW
\end{align*}
\]
Analysis

• Assume S < HIGH < TS
• Assume SOUTH, EAST, WEST different
• Resulting lattice has:
  – 4 clearances (LOW < S < HIGH < TS)
  – 3 categories (SOUTH, EAST, WEST)

Same Policies

• If we can change policies that components must meet, composition is trivial (as above)
• If we cannot, we must show composition meets the same policy as that of components; this can be very hard
Different Policies

• What does “secure” now mean?
• Which policy (components) dominates?
• Possible principles:
  – Any access allowed by policy of a component must be allowed by composition of components (autonomy)
  – Any access forbidden by policy of a component must be forbidden by composition of components (security)

Implications

• Composite system satisfies security policy of components as components’ policies take precedence
• If something neither allowed nor forbidden by principles, then:
  – Allow it (Gong & Qian)
  – Disallow it (Fail-Safe Defaults)
Example

- System X: Bob can’t access Alice’s files
- System Y: Eve, Lilith can access each other’s files
- Composition policy:
  - Bob can access Eve’s files
  - Lilith can access Alice’s files
- Question: can Bob access Lilith’s files?

Solution (Gong & Qian)

- Notation:
  - \((a, b)\): \(a\) can read \(b\)’s files
  - \(\text{AS}(x)\): access set of system \(x\)
- Set-up:
  - \(\text{AS}(X) = \emptyset\)
  - \(\text{AS}(Y) = \{ (\text{Eve}, \text{Lilith}), (\text{Lilith}, \text{Eve}) \}\)
  - \(\text{AS}(X \cup Y) = \{ (\text{Bob}, \text{Eve}), (\text{Lilith}, \text{Alice}), (\text{Eve}, \text{Lilith}), (\text{Lilith}, \text{Eve}) \}\)
Solution (Gong & Qian)

• Compute transitive closure of AS(X∪Y):
  – AS(X∪Y)+ = {
    (Bob, Eve), (Bob, Lilith), (Bob, Alice),
    (Eve, Lilith), (Eve, Alice),
    (Lilith, Eve), (Lilith, Alice) }

• Delete accesses conflicting with policies of components:
  – Delete (Bob, Alice)

• (Bob, Lilith) in set, so Bob can access Lilith’s files

Idea

• Composition of policies allows accesses not mentioned by original policies
• Generate all possible allowed accesses
  – Computation of transitive closure
• Eliminate forbidden accesses
  – Removal of accesses disallowed by individual access policies
• Everything else is allowed
• Note; determining if access allowed is of polynomial complexity
Interference

• Think of it as something used in communication
  – Holly/Lara example: Holly interferes with the CPU utilization, and Lara detects it—communication
• Plays role of writing (interfering) and reading (detecting the interference)

Model

• System as state machine
  – Subjects $S = \{ s_i \}$
  – States $\Sigma = \{ \sigma_i \}$
  – Outputs $O = \{ o_i \}$
  – Commands $Z = \{ z_i \}$
  – State transition commands $C = S \times Z$
• Note: no inputs
  – Encode either as selection of commands or in state transition commands
Functions

• State transition function $T: C \times \Sigma \rightarrow \Sigma$
  – Describes effect of executing command $c$ in state $\sigma$
• Output function $P: C \times \Sigma \rightarrow O$
  – Output of machine when executing command $c$ in state $s$
• Initial state is $\sigma_0$

Example

• Users Heidi (high), Lucy (low)
• 2 bits of state, $H$ (high) and $L$ (low)
  – System state is $(H, L)$ where $H, L$ are 0, 1
• 2 commands: xor0, xor1 do xor with 0, 1
  – Operations affect both state bits regardless of whether Heidi or Lucy issues it
Example: 2-bit Machine

- \( S = \{ \text{Heidi, Lucy} \} \)
- \( \Sigma = \{ (0,0), (0,1), (1,0), (1,1) \} \)
- \( C = \{ \text{xor0, xor1} \} \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Input States ((H, L))</th>
<th>(0,0)</th>
<th>(0,1)</th>
<th>(1,0)</th>
<th>(1,1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>xor0</td>
<td>(0,0)</td>
<td>(0,1)</td>
<td>(1,0)</td>
<td>(1,1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xor1</td>
<td>(1,1)</td>
<td>(1,0)</td>
<td>(0,1)</td>
<td>(0,0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outputs and States

- \( T \) is inductive in first argument, as
  \( T(c_0, \sigma_0) = \sigma_1; \ T(c_{i+1}, \sigma_{i+1}) = T(c_{i+1}, T(c_i, \sigma_i)) \)
- Let \( C^* \) be set of possible sequences of commands in \( C \)
- \( T^*: C^* \times \Sigma \rightarrow \Sigma \) and
  \( c_s = c_0 … c_n \Rightarrow T^*(c_s, \sigma_i) = T(c_n, …, T(c_0, \sigma_i)…) \)
- \( P \) similar; define \( P^* \) similarly
Projection

• $T^*(c_s, \sigma_i)$ sequence of state transitions
• $P^*(c_s, \sigma_i)$ corresponding outputs
• $\text{proj}(s, c_s, \sigma_i)$ set of outputs in $P^*(c_s, \sigma_i)$ that subject $s$ authorized to see
  – In same order as they occur in $P^*(c_s, \sigma_i)$
  – Projection of outputs for $s$
• Intuition: list of outputs after removing outputs that $s$ cannot see

Purge

• $G \subseteq S$, $G$ a group of subjects
• $A \subseteq Z$, $A$ a set of commands
• $\pi_G(c_s)$ subsequence of $c_s$ with all elements $(s,z)$, $s \in G$ deleted
• $\pi_A(c_s)$ subsequence of $c_s$ with all elements $(s,z)$, $z \in A$ deleted
• $\pi_{G,A}(c_s)$ subsequence of $c_s$ with all elements $(s,z)$, $s \in G$ and $z \in A$ deleted
Example: 2-bit Machine

• Let $\sigma_0 = (0,1)$
• 3 commands applied:
  – Heidi applies $xor0$
  – Lucy applies $xor1$
  – Heidi applies $xor1$
• $cs = ((Heidi,xor0),(Lucy,xor1),(Heidi,xor0))$
• Output is 011001
  – Shorthand for sequence $(0,1)(1,0)(0,1)$

Example

• $proj(Heidi, cs, \sigma_0) = 011001$
• $proj(Lucy, cs, \sigma_0) = 101$
• $\pi_{Lucy}(c_s) = (Heidi,xor0), (Heidi,xor1)$
• $\pi_{Lucy,xor1}(c_s) = (Heidi,xor0), (Heidi,xor1)$
• $\pi_{Heidi}(c_s) = (Lucy,xor1)$
Example

- \( \pi_{\text{Lucy}, \text{xor}0}(c_s) = (\text{Heidi}, \text{xor}0), (\text{Lucy}, \text{xor}1), (\text{Heidi}, \text{xor}1) \)
- \( \pi_{\text{Heidi}, \text{xor}0}(c_s) = \pi_{\text{xor}0}(c_s) = (\text{Lucy}, \text{xor}1), (\text{Heidi}, \text{xor}1) \)
- \( \pi_{\text{Heidi}, \text{xor}1}(c_s) = (\text{Heidi}, \text{xor}0), (\text{Lucy}, \text{xor}1) \)
- \( \pi_{\text{xor}1}(c_s) = (\text{Heidi}, \text{xor}0) \)

Noninterference

- Intuition: Set of outputs Lucy can see corresponds to set of inputs she can see, there is no interference
- Formally: \( G, G' \subseteq S, G \neq G'; A \subseteq Z \); Users in \( G \) executing commands in \( A \) are noninterfering with users in \( G' \) iff for all \( c_s \in C^* \), and for all \( s \in G' \),
  \[
  \text{proj}(s, c_s, \sigma_i) = \text{proj}(s, p_{G,A}(c_s), \sigma_i)
  \]
  - Written \( A,G :| G' \)
Example

- Let \( c_s = ((\text{Heidi}, \text{xor}0), (\text{Lucy}, \text{xor}1), (\text{Heidi}, \text{xor}1), \sigma_0 = (0, 1) \)
- Take \( G = \{ \text{Heidi} \}, G' = \{ \text{Lucy} \}, A = \emptyset \)
- \( \pi_{\text{Heidi}}(c_s) = (\text{Lucy}, \text{xor}1) \)
  - So \( \text{proj}(\text{Lucy}, \pi_{\text{Heidi}}(c_s), \sigma_0) = 0 \)
- \( \text{proj}(\text{Lucy}, c_s, \sigma_0) = 101 \)
- So \( \{ \text{Heidi} \} :| \{ \text{Lucy} \} \) is false
  - Makes sense; commands issued to change \( H \) bit also affect \( L \) bit

Example

- Same as before, but Heidi’s commands affect \( H \) bit only, Lucy’s the \( L \) bit only
- Output is \( 0_H 0_L 1_H \)
- \( \pi_{\text{Heidi}}(c_s) = (\text{Lucy}, \text{xor}1) \)
  - So \( \text{proj}(\text{Lucy}, \pi_{\text{Heidi}}(c_s), \sigma_0) = 0 \)
- \( \text{proj}(\text{Lucy}, c_s, \sigma_0) = 0 \)
- So \( \{ \text{Heidi} \} :| \{ \text{Lucy} \} \) is true
  - Makes sense; commands issued to change \( H \) bit now do not affect \( L \) bit
Security Policy

• Partitions systems into authorized, unauthorized states
• Authorized states have no forbidden interferences
• Hence a security policy is a set of noninterference assertions
  – See previous definition