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Research question?

Can we unify these two approaches? (to some extent)
Background: UMLsec

UMLsec is a lightweight extension of UML by means of stereotypes and tagged values.

- Formally well-founded (based on a formalization of a fragment of UML).
- Supports a collection of different security verification techniques across UML system views.
- Tool supported.
Background: UMLsec

UMLsec extends Class, Sequence, Activity, Statechart and Deployment diagrams and allows to verify Dolev-Yao cryptography, Non-interference and RBAC among others. There is tool support for most of the UMLsec stereotypes.
Background: MBT with Schemas

- Automated test generation from security properties to testing needs using schemas
- Ensure security property coverage
- Traceability between generated tests and security property
Background: MBT with Schemas

Schema Language: Allows a straightforward, imperative-programming-like definition of Test Schemas, from which automatic test sequences can be generated. For example:

```plaintext
for_each $X from S,
use any_operation any_number_of_times
to_reach state_respecting T
on_instance 'chosen_instance' then
use $X at_least_once to_reach state_respecting Q
on_instance 'chosen_instance'
```
Security in Smart-card Life-cycle

A smart-card has typically a well-defined life-cycle, that ranges from pre-deployment to active and eventually to a locked-status or a terminated status where is not possible to use the card any more.
Security in Smart-card Life-cycle

Example: Global Platform Specification v 2.1.1 on the Card Life Cycle Scope
Security in Smart-card Life-cycle

Natural security requirements on the life-cycle to prevent D.O.S attacks:

**Security Property 1:** For any execution, whenever the card is set to the state TERMINATED by means of an operation performed by a privileged application, then it should not be possible to revert to another state.

**Security Property 2:** It should not be possible for an application that does not have the given privilege to set the card into a given state TERMINATED.
Correct security testing

Main ideas:

- Is the expected behaviour, as described by the models in MBT already trivially violating the security properties to be tested?
- Can we improve the quality of the MBT by using the UMLsec philosophy?
- Can we also automatically generate schemas from this analysis?
Correct security testing

UMLsec new stereotypes for Security Properties 1 and 2 on statecharts:

<<locked-status>> together with tag {status} specifies a status (node) in the statechart that should not have outgoing transitions to other nodes.

<<authorized>> together with tags {status} and {permission} checks that all transitions to a given node contain a given permission check in their guard.
Correct security testing

From the testing perspective, we can express the security properties as hoare triples \{P\} S \{Q\} where P and Q are FOL formulas quantifying over system variables and S is a set of system commands. For example:

Locked-status:

\[
\{\text{state} = \{\text{status}\}\} \text{ set\_status } \{\text{state} = \{\text{status}\}\}
\]

Authorized:

\[
T := \text{state} \neq \{\text{status}\} \land \{\text{permission}\} \notin A.\text{permissions} \\
Q := \text{statusWord} = \text{Error\_not\_Privilege}\_{\{\text{permission}\}}. \\
\{T\} \text{ set\_status } \{Q\}
\]
Validation

Automatically verified some violating models of the GP v 2.1.1 card life-cycle
Validation

Generated schema:

```
for_each $X from APDU_Set_status,
use any_operation any_number_of_times to_reach
state_respecting (self.lcs->exists(lc : LogicalChannel|
lc.selectedApp.privileges.cardTerminate=false))
on_instance "card" then
use any_operation any_number_of_times
to_reach state_respecting (self.state!=TERMINATED)
on_instance "card" then
use $X at_least_once to_reach
state_respecting
(self.StatusWord =
APDU_SETSTATUS_ERROR_MustHaveTerminatePriv)
on_instance "card"
```

Using the schema we have generated 13 tests.
CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

- Take into account the evolution aspect i.e
- Specification can evolve thus the model and/or
- The security property can evolve
- Schema language extensions
- Methods and tools’ evaluation on other systems and for other security properties.
- Integration of tool support
Questions?