

PROVe & RUN

Confidential

77, avenue Niel, 75017 Paris, France

contact@provenrun.com

Our mission

Enable the Internet of Tomorrow = Internet of Things + Security

Without security:

- Impossible to deploy a network of connected devices
- Impossible to scale the Internet of Things
- Impossible to trust a system to keep data private & confidential



July 2015 Miller & Valasek's Attack

- Malicious connection to infotainment through Uconnect[™].
- Malicious firmware update.
- Sending of fake / impersonating commands (commands for the conditioning, for the engine, ...)



Wired magazine 7/21/2015

⇒ Combination of logical problems on open architecture



Car Hacking – Jeep example



The Security Challenge

- Security chain:
 - Cryptographic algorithms
 - Cryptographic protocols
 - Physical attacks resistant subsystems (e.g. secure elements)
 - Robustness of the Trusted Computing Base (TCB) to logical attacks



- Issues with errors and vulnerabilities, particularly in operating systems:
 - An already alarming situation which is still degrading (e.g. the NIST database statistics).



The main challenge is to secure the software

- Hackers will exploit bugs, weaknesses and errors that exist in thousands in the software of embedded systems
- It is not possible to <u>directly</u> protect against attacks OSes such as iOS, Android, Linux, large RTOS ... There are issues with:
 - Size of the software stack to secure
 - "Trusted Computing Base" (TCB) includes kernel whose size and complexity are too big to build trust (and correctness of security properties)

Issues & vulnerabilities, particularly in operating systems.



Security need evolution (1/2)

- Small TCB with few peripherals and small attack
 surface
 - Secure element is usually the right solution
 - Resistance to physical attack is the biggest challenge
- More peripherals and thus larger TCB and larger attack surface (typically mobile security)
 - Use a small secure OS/kernel (TEE),
 - Resistance to physical attack can be addressed with secure elements or similar embedded IP,
 - Resistance to logical attack becomes the biggest challenge



Security need evolution (2/2)

- IOT case : Still more peripherals, better business model for hackers, larger damages at stake, with large TCB and large attack surface, in many cases remote device is unattended, etc.
 - Logical and Physical TCB are to be distinguished
 - Resistance to physical attack can still be addressed with secure elements or similar embedded IP
 - The secure OS/kernel (such as the TEE), and all other complex part of the TCB need to be formally verified
 - Resistance to logical attack is achieved using a trusted and reliable security rationale (Attacks exploit error in the security rationale)



Prove & Run answer's to the challenge

- Two critical secure COTS (ready for integration) that are needed to host "security sensitive" applications and build layered security perimeters:
 - **ProvenCore** : microkernel proven for security to secure gateways and connected devices (Industrial Things), smartphone, tablets, etc.
 - Execution of security critical applications
 - Secure protection of the "Smart and Safe world" (Existing OS)
 - Provided together with its <u>secure boot</u>
 - ProvenVisor: proven secure hypervisor for mobile devices and IoT virtualization solutions
 - Secure isolation of existing OS and legacy SW stack
 - **Built with ProvenTools:** a patented software development tool that makes it possible to formally prove the correctness of the software
 - Be as close as possible to "zero-bug"

- The rationale of why security is achieved should be provided in an explicit and auditable format
 - Risk analysis,
 - Product security requirements,

- The rationale of why security is achieved needs to be provided in an auditable format
 - Risk analysis,
 - Product security requirements,

Confidence in rationale is key

- The rationale of why security is achieved needs to be provided in an auditable format
 - Risk analysis,
 - Product security requirements,
 - Identifying the TCB,

- The rationale of why security is achieved needs to be provided in an auditable format
 - Risk analysis,
 - Product security requirements,
 - Identifying the TCB,

The TCB against logical attacks

- The rationale of why security is achieved needs to be provided in an auditable format
 - Risk analysis,
 - Product security requirements,
 - Identifying the TCB,

TCB should be small enough to be trustabe

- The rationale of why security is achieved needs to be provided in an auditable format
 - Risk analysis,
 - Product security requirements,
 - Identifying the TCB,

Large Oses such as Linux, Or Android when used should not be part of the TCB

- The rationale of why security is achieved needs to be provided in an auditable format
 - Risk analysis,
 - Product security requirements,
 - Identifying the TCB,

Layered architectures highly recommended













Trusted Computing Base

Remote attacks exploit entry points



Remote attacks exploit entry points



Remote attacks exploit entry points



Introduction to TrustZone



























- The rationale of why security is achieved needs to be provided in an auditable format
 - Risk analysis,
 - Product security requirements,
 - Identifying the TCB,
- Confidence in the rationale becomes the key to security
 - Some parts of the rationale can be informal and be tested and/ or evaluated using traditional approaches,
 - For some others trust and confidence in the absence of errors can only be achieved using formal proof.
 - This is the case of kernels that are part of the TCB











Using a Hypervisor



Wrong expectations about Hypervisors



Prove & Run answer's to the challenge

- An hypervisor is used to virtualize hardware
 - Either because you want to replace two or more processors by a single one
 - Or because you want to have more virtual chips to isolate software stacks.
- It is thus important to do it securely and this is why we need a really secure hypervisor such as
 ProvenVisor

But an hypervisor is just not enough









- A kernel such as the one of Linux, QNX, Android, etc. is too large to be practically proven or shown to be secure,
 - Hackers will always find weaknesses to exploit.
- So such a kernel cannot be put directly in contact with the external world,
- A (secure) hypervisor is not the solution for that problem either
 - As you have to let the same communication media open

•

Some sub-systems remain in contact





- Secure applications are needed to implement
 - firewalling (low level and high level),
 - Secure application management,
 - Secure (OTA) firmware update,
 - Secure authentication,
 - Etc.





- Such applications cannot be implemented on bare metal
 - Otherwise too complex and error prone => would need to be formally proven by themselves,
 - They cannot be implemented on a non proven kernel (otherwise same problem again).
- They can only be implemented on top of a <u>formally proven kernel</u> that is close to zero bug.



Implementation (Main Use Case)





Implementation (Other Possibility)





Implementation (To further isolate applications)





A secure OS/Kernel is required

- You need to have security applications to do various tasks:
 - Filtering on various communications channels, using and managing keys, administrating configurations and security, logging events, possibly performing various analysis and attack responses, ...
- You need to place such secure applications on a trusted and robust ground :
 - Not on large untrusted OS, Not on Linux (even sitting on a hypervisor, as it will have to communicate and interact with the peripherals and is this thus vulnerable)
 - Not on hardware,
 - Not on an hypervisor (which would provide by definition a similar hardware abstraction)





Prove & Run answer's to the challenge

- Two critical secure COTS (ready for integration) that are needed to host "security sensitive" applications and build security perimeters:
 - **ProvenCore** : microkernel proven for security to secure gateways and connected devices (Industrial Things), smartphone, tablets, etc.
 - Execution of security critical applications
 - Secure protection of the "Smart and Safe world" (Existing OS)
 - Provided together with its <u>secure boot</u>
 - ProvenVisor: proven secure hypervisor for mobile devices and IoT virtualization solutions
 - Secure isolation of existing OS and legacy SW stack
 - **Built with ProvenTools:** a patented software development tool that makes it possible to formally prove the correctness of the software
 - Be as close as possible to "zero-bug"

With ProvenCore and ProvenVisor, Secure a Smart and Safe Embedded World



The 2 missing bricks needed to create the Internet of Tomorrow



Conclusion

- With a <u>secure boot</u> and one or two COTS you can secure virtually any architecture:
 - **ProvenCore** : a microkernel proven for security.
 - Execution of security critical applications (firewalling, FOTA, etc.)
 - Secure protection of the "Smart and Safe world" (Existing OS)
 - **ProvenVisor** (optional) : a proven secure
 - Secure isolation of existing OS and legacy SW stack
 - Built with ProvenTools:
 - To be as close as possible to "zero-bug"

