System Architecture & Security

Experiences from real life design decisions or A network and security expert in API land

Martin Fredriksson <m@carmensystems.com>





Contents

- Introduction: lightspeed overview of the Carmen system
- We have assumed control: System
 Architecture views
- *Steps in the right direction*: Design examples and discussions



Airline-in-a-box





Carmen development/business model





Why Architecture? What's wrong with this picture?





Star Architecture



But what about:

- Synchronizing activities?
- Auditing?
- System maintenance?
- Deployment?
- Network security?

Not enough for a complete System...



System Architecture Overview





User Interfaces





Layered System and Security Model





Access Control Model

Key design principles:

Completeness: The ACS must always be invoked (e.g. used in all access methods) and impossible to bypass.

- Isolation: The system must be tamper-proof.
- Verifiability: The system must be shown to be properly implemented.
- **Flexibility**: The system should be able to enforce the access control policies defined by specific customer needs.
- **Simplicity**: The security policy model should be kept as simple as possible (to minimize ACSdb and audit trail complexity) while still supporting the flexibility principle.
- Manageability: The system must be easily manageable, via intuitive user interfaces using terms/rules that users can understand.
- **Scalability**: The system must support the number of users/roles/data classes/resources needed by the customer.



Reference Monitor Access Control model

All attempts by a subject to access an object are controlled by the reference monitor in accordance with a security policy embodied in the access control database. Security-relevant events are stored in the audit trail db (audit file).



Three levels of the ACS





Client/Server Model





Different views for different *roles*

C Ale	🗲 Alerts View									
🔍 🔍 🔍 🗄 🎚 🏋 🖉 🕜 None 🧭 Day 🧭 Hour 🔛 Resource Type 💁 Resource 🦣 Base 💁 Rule 🐫 Planner										
	1/10 00:47									2004/11/13 02:31
Wed	10			Thu 11			Fri 12			Sat 13
Alerts 12 PAIRING										
	15									
	2	l i	🔗 ि	Show Crew Rosters	1	2	~ 9			
			3	Show Trips		F	LIGHT			
				Show Flights						
C A	lerts View -	Manager								
10	Ç Alerts View - Manager								_ 🗆 🔀	
Q	🔍 🔍 🕄 🗄 🏋 👘 🧭 None 🏵 Day 🧭 Hour 🛛 🛄 Resource Type 🏡 Resource 🏡 Base 🏡 Rule 🏡 Planner									
	04/11/10 00:47									2004/11/13 01:23
V	/Ved 10			Thu 11			Fri 12			Sat
					Alerts					<u>^</u>
	5	PAIRING W	ed10	7	PAIRING Thu	11				
				🕰 🖄						=
	<u>لل</u>		Andrea Mark							
	6	CRE	Assign Alert			4 CRE	W Thu11 5	CREW Fri12		
						2	2			
						4	•		3	~
						1				
put	assignedto te	resdesc PAIRING	resid 1035	activity AA+667++10NOV20 1	description	JFK	ACTIVE	event 04Nov10 13:15 🔨	1 alerts	
									putte	
									ACTIVE	
									2004/11/10 1	4:15 💽
								✓	A 🧟 🗸	ssian Alert



Data Management (DAVE) layered model





DAVE - High Availability





Deployment example









Installing a new machine





Summary

- Security = ACS + Quality
 - Much of the security design is for redundancy, load balancing and other system quality issues
 - Protection against mistakes as well as deliberate attacks
- Real security must be supported by in-depth architecture (and implementation); there just is no shortcut...
- The network security view is necessary as a complement to components views
 - Components and APIs for developers
 - Protocols and Data Formats are a must for system security



I conclude that there are two ways of constructing a software design: One way is to make it so simple that there are *obviously* no deficiencies and the other way is to make it so complicated that there are no *obvious* deficiencies.

C.A.R Hoare, Turing Lecture "The Emperor's Old Clothes", CACM February 1981, pp. 75-83



THE END

