

Building Secure OpenVMS Applications

**Robert Gezelter Software Consultant
35 – 20 167th Street, Suite 215
Flushing, New York 11358 – 1731
United States of America**

**+1 (718) 463 1079
gezelter@rlgsc.com
<http://www.rlgsc.com>**

**Friday, October 6, 2000
8:00 am – 9:15 am
Room 501B-C**

**Compaq Enterprise Symposium 2000
Los Angeles Convention Center
Los Angeles, California**

What Makes a Secure OpenVMS Application?

Good fences make good neighbors

***- “Mending Wall”
North of Boston, 1914
Robert Frost***

Why?

Primary Reason – Control Business Risk

Risks:

- Personnel Disclosure
(SSN, Medical, Personnel)***
- Business Disclosure
(Publicity, Loss of Advantage,
SEC)***
- Accountability***
- Corruption/Contamination***

Technical Goals

Secondary Reasons - Maintain

- System Integrity***
- Accountability***
- Auditability***

How?

“For your protection and ours, this envelope will be opened in the presence of two bank staff members”
– Citibank Deposit/Payment Envelope (1980)

Is performance an issue?

- Not generally an issue***
- Carefully identify bottlenecks***
- Eliminate Bottlenecks***
- Security is almost NEVER the reason for a PERFORMANCE problem***

What Makes a secure OpenVMS Application?

OpenVMS itself is rated C2.

Running a C2-rated operating system is not sufficient. Applications must be designed to not compromise the integrity and containment of the C2-criteria.

Security Critical Areas

- Access Control***
- Privileges***
- Re-invention***
- Contamination***

Access Control

Five sample areas:

- *Password Management*
- *DECnet TASK Object*
- *File Protection and Applications*
- *Account/Access Management
(SYSUAF, RIGHTSLIST, SYLOGIN)*
- *Access Method Restrictions*

Password Management

- ***Change Frequency – Too Often is not good***
- ***Pronounceability – Important***
- ***Machine Generated – Good, if pronounceable***

DECnet TASK Object

- *facility used for worm attacks*
- *worm attacks have used GUEST and default accts*
- *No alternative if network applications are to be developed (alternatives require \geq SYSPRV)*

DECnet TASK Object (cont'd)

- *safe if used properly*
 - *NO DEFAULT ACCOUNTS*
 - *NO GUEST ACCOUNT*
 - */NONETWORK qualifier*
 - *NONETMBX qualifier*

File Protection and Applications

- ***Access Control Lists and Identifiers***
 - ***Do NOT grant access to individuals***
 - ***Files may be accessed by identified classes of users***
 - ***Individual accounts are given access to classes of data (Rights Identifiers)***
 - ***Procedures at access removal/de-briefing***

File Protection and Applications (cont'd)

- ***Do NOT block attempts beyond authorization – let the OpenVMS Security Alarms be triggered***
- ***Break single files into multiple files to permit different security levels***

File Protection and Applications

(cont'd)

Examples:

- **Data Files (Read/Write/No Access)**
- **Executable Files (Execute/No Access)**
- **Protected Subsystems**

Good:

(IDENTIFIER=PAYROLL_CLERK,ACCESS=READ)
(IDENTIFIER=PAYROLL_SUPERVISOR,ACCESS=READ+WRITE)
(IDENTIFIER=PAYROLL_CLERK,ACCESS=EXECUTE)

Bad:

(IDENTIFIER=SMITH_J,ACCESS=READ)
(IDENTIFIER=DOE_JA,ACCESS=READ+WRITE)
(IDENTIFIER=SMITH_J,ACCESS=EXECUTE)

Account/Access Management

- ***SYSUAF***
 - ***Automatic Account Expiration***
 - ***NO Generic Accounts***
 - ***Automatic Logon Facility (ALF)***
 - ***Captive Flag***

Account/Access Management (cont'd)

- ***RIGHTSLIST–***
 - ***By Application Function***
 - ***Separate from UIC (SOGW)***
 - ***Paperwork policies***

Examples:

PAYROLL_CLERK - Read Access

PAYROLL_ENTRY - Write Access Hours-only

PAYROLL_SUPERVISOR - Modify Access

Account/Access Management (cont'd)

- ***System Login***
 - ***Check access based upon source***
 - ***More complicated than SYSUAF***
 - ***Use Rights Identifiers as Input***
- ***Group/Application Logins***
 - ***Enforce Group/Role Requirements***
 - ***Remember, User cannot override***
 - ***Check for safe environment***

Access Method Restrictions

- *Protected Subsystems*
- *Type of Access*
- *Take the alarm*

Privileges

In a word: Just Say NO.

Permissible: TMPMBX

Possible: NETMBX

***Never: Any Devour Class
NO SYSPRV, CMKRNL, etc.***

Reasons:

- Too Broad
- No granularity
- Subverts accountability
- Compromises system integrity

Contamination

***Single Thread Application:
Generally safe and within the
OpenVMS security model.***

***Multi-threaded Applications:
Integrity and security outside
of the OpenVMS model;
You are on your own!***

Contamination (Cont'd)

Suggestion:

***Use Shareable Libraries to get the memory advantages of common executables without the Contamination hazard.
(See session 460).***

Re-Invention

When you re-write something, it is a reliable bet that you will forget about some seemingly small feature. Unfortunately, system security depends upon the interaction of many small, seemingly baroque details.

Re-Invention (cont'd)

Example:

If your application needs a LOGIN authentication mechanism, use LOGINOUT and AUTHORIZE in concert with SYSUAF and RIGHTSLIST to validate and login your users. Attempting to replicate the functionality is more likely to lead to a security breach

Re-Invention (cont'd)

If you require some capability not in standard LOGINOUT, consider using the exit or use or use an image executed through SYLOGIN.COM.

Summary:

It is possible to build extremely robust and secure applications under OpenVMS; provided that you do not compromise the integrity of the system; instead use OpenVMS and its underlying capabilities to maximal advantage and leverage your own efforts.

Questions?

Robert Gezelter Software Consultant
35 – 20 167th Street, Suite 215
Flushing, New York 11358 – 1731
United States of America

+1 (718) 463 1079
gezelter@rlgsc.com
<http://www.rlgsc.com>

Session Notes & Materials:

<http://www.rlgsc.com/cets/2000/index.html>