Limiting side-effects of applications at compile time

2019-08-12 @ BornHack, Funen (Denmark)



Overview

- About me (very shortly)
- How and why is it relevant (benefits)
- Demo (OSM + MET)
 - NixOS : 5ab28d2f7e09bb8027ebc881343b381b8001543a611e8f3566b80c0d9b3a9b47
 - Docker : 5e0e931f4070495f7329f1d1b61120b354bcae84c29186f79688a6e924959b98
- Note: Slides are released under the CC BY-SA license
 - Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike ("copyleft")



About me (very shortly)

- Ramón Soto Mathiesen (Spaniard + Dane)
- MSc. Computer Science and minors in Mathematics
- **CompSci** @ SPISE MISU ApS
 - Trying to solve EU GDPR with a scientific approach (https://uniprocess.org)
 - Permissive copyleft license (LGPL-3.0)
 - Mostly with **Haskell** and to a lesser extend **Elm** (**PureScript**)
- Member of the Free Software Foundation (FSF) since **November 2007**
- Founder of Meetup F#unctional Copenhageners EST. November 2013
- Blog: http://blog.stermon.com/ (slides under /talks/)

Matching of expectations

- You don't need to know Haskell in order to understand this talk (Out of curiosity, how many devs? statically type?)
- In this talk, we will see how it's possible to *limit* the side-effects of an application at *compile-time* (translate code to binary)
- We will also see why this is *relevant* and which *benefits* we get by using this approach

Note: Please save your question to the QA at the end of the talk

The tool



- Haskell is a standardized, general-purpose, purely functional programming language with non-strict semantics (lazy) and strong static typing
- Haskell is widely used in the academia, but lately, it's also beginning to catch up in the *industry*, thanks to companies like FP Complete and Galois Inc in the States and Tweag.IO in Europe

Effects vs Purity



• In Haskell, there is a clear separation, which is enforced by the type system and the compiler, between pure code (always evaluate to the same output given the same input and does not cause any side effects such as mutation of mutable objects or output to I/O devices) and code that produces effects:

Parent calls children	Parent with effects	Parent pure
Child with effects	✓ Code with effects	✗Compiler error
Child pure	✓ Code with effects	✓ Pure code

Effects vs Purity



Effects vs Purity

- All Haskell applications have a *parental code* branch with *all possible* input and output *effects* (I/O).
- This is what allows us to create all kinds of applications (*equivalence* with *Turing complete* languages)
- If this were not the case, we could not be able to provide inputs or see the output of the calculations and, therefore, it would be a waste of time to execute any application

Restrict effects, granularly

- Now, it's not always the case that if a branch of the code is allowed to have side effects, these should be all the possible side effects
- For example: We want to send confidential data to a database, but we do not want our subcontractor, who manages that part of the code, to send such sensitive information to their own servers

What is happening? Data leaks



ssh-decorator (Python package) leaks your SSH data

What is happening? Data leaks



strong_password (Ruby library) backdoor paste.bin

Cybersecurity



Cybersecurity now a days, just consist in stemming the tide of the unavoidable !!!

Cybersecurity



Cybersecurity now a days, just consist in stemming the tide of the unavoidable !!!

Cybersecurity



Cybersecurity now a days, just consist in stemming the tide of the unavoidable !!!

Bridge over Troubled Water



 In Haskell, the bridge that is responsible for binding the pure code in combination the with code containing effects, is called monads

• **Monads** are structures that represent calculations defined as a sequence of steps.

Bridge over Troubled Water

- So these bridges that are responsible for binding the pure code with the code branches with effects, can do so gradually allowing us to make sure that if we only allow a part of the code to access the network, it can only do that side-effect
- For example: We want to *ensure* (by design) that our application *only accesses* the content of a *specific page* in the network (effect) where that content should be *displayed* on the *output device* of the console (another effect) *adding date and time stamps* (third effect)

Code example (Demo)

```
granulated -- Granulation of effects
::
   ( Effects.ConsoleOutM io
   , Effects.DateTimeM io
   , Effects.SpecificWebsiteM io
   )
   => io ()
granulated =
   ...
```

main :: IO () -- Signature of the main entrance of the application
main =

-- By binding the main function with our granulated function, the -- application, is automatically isolated to the designated effects granulated

Code example (Demo)

-- DESIGN OF EFFECTS (no implementation details)

```
class Monad m => ConsoleOutM m where
  out :: String -> m ()
```

```
class Monad m => DateTimeM m where
  now :: m UTCTime
  today :: m (Integer, Int, Int)
```

class Monad m => SpecificWebsiteM m where
 tlsManager :: m Manager
 request :: String -> m Request
 responseBytes :: Request -> Manager -> m (Response L8.ByteString)
 responseNoBody :: Request -> Manager -> m (Response ())

Code example (Demo)

-- IMPLEMENTATION OF EFFECTS

```
instance ConsoleOutM IO where
   out = putStrLn
```

```
instance DateTimeM IO where
now = getCurrentTime
today = toGregorian . utctDay <$> getCurrentTime
```

```
instance SpecificWebsiteM IO where
  request relativeUrl = parseRequest $ uri ++ relativeUrl
```

```
uri = -- Haskell has immutable data, so this can't be changed
    "https://@specificwebiste.com/"
```

2019-08-12

. . .



All effects (I/O) vs Granulated (Output to the Console \cup Time and Date \cup Specific Page)

Principle of Least Privilege (PoLP)

- This approach is well known in information security and computer science as *principle of least privilege* (PoLP) where a *process*, a user, or a program (depending on the subject) *must* be able to *access only* the *information* and *resources* that are *necessary* for its *legitimate purpose*
- Haskell, among very few, can enforce this at compile-time

Design and outsource

 Thanks to the granulation of effects, it would be enough for companies to design and implement the effects layer and then outsource the development to anyone with the necessary knowledge, even the best black-hat hackers, knowing that the code they receive will comply (*) 100% with their initial design

(*) compiler flags needed to avoid unsafePerformIO usage:

... -XSafe -fpackage-trust -trust=base ...

(very) Relevant cos EU GDPR



- "One example: The requirement for data minimization (Article 5(1)(c)) means that you must be able to demonstrate that every business process that touches personal data (and every technology that contributes to it) is designed in such a way that it uses the smallest possible amount of data for the shortest possible period of time while exposing it to the fewest possible eyeballs and ensuring that it is deleted as quickly as possible when the processing purpose is completed" -- Tim Walters
- ICO (UK) to fine British Airways with 183m GBP and Marriot with 99m GBP

Summary



- Effects vs Purity, and what it brings to the table
- Restrict effects, granularly (all effects vs limited)
- Cybersecurity ("All your data leaks are belong to us")
- Principle of Least Privilege (PoLP) at compile-time
- Design and outsourcing (even to the best black-hat hackers)
- EU GPDR: "data protection by design and by default", previously known as "privacy by design" to avoid getting fined and live up to the law from a "technical point-of-view"
- Demo (https://reproducible-builds.org/ -> reproducible **hashes** for **binaries**):
 - NixOS : 5ab28d2f7e09bb8027ebc881343b381b8001543a611e8f3566b80c0d9b3a9b47
 - Docker : 5e0e931f4070495f7329f1d1b61120b354bcae84c29186f79688a6e924959b98



Any questions?