

Accountable Javascript Code Delivery

Ilkan Esiyok* (CISPA), Pascal Berrang (University of Birmingham and Nimiq), Katriel Cohn-Gordon (Meta), Robert Kuennemann (CISPA)

NDSS 2023, San Diego





The web is ephemeral





The web page looks the same but the active content has changed



A compromised or malicious web server can easily target classes of users:

• The web server might insert malware based on browser fingerprint





A compromised or malicious web server can easily target classes of users:

- The web server might insert malware based on browser fingerprint
- The server might use the browser for cryptojacking





A compromised or malicious web server can easily target classes of users:

- The web server might insert malware based on browser fingerprint
- The server might use the browser for cryptojacking



There is a lack of trust between developers and users in web infrastructure



- Our target audience: websites that want to establish and maintain trust to their users
- Examples:



- Our target audience: websites that want to establish and maintain trust to their users
- Examples:



wants users to trust that they really encrypt their emails



- Our target audience: websites that want to establish and maintain trust to their users
- Examples:



wants users to trust that they really encrypt their emails

wants users to trust that they don't have access to users' funds



- Our target audience: websites that want to establish and maintain trust to their users
- Examples:



wants users to trust that they really encrypt their emails

wants users to trust that they don't have access to users' funds

Code Verify : allow users to trust that the web client keeps their messages secret



Risk mitigation strategies



Risk mitigation strategies

- Auditing
 - Works for App stores

8 Malicious server can choose to load unaudited code in runtime









Risk mitigation strategies

- Accountability
 - Solution Works for App stores (Developers can be held accountable for malicious code)
 - 8 No public record of the code and the developer's identity







Efficient and easy code signing



Proof of origin









ACCOUNTABLE JS





- Provide a signed manifest enumerating all the active content
- Browser extension
 - Measures the delivered active content and compares with the manifest



- Separate the developer and the web server
- Use public transparency logs





- Simple text file in JSON format
- List of metadata for each active content in the web page

```
manifest.json
      "url": "https://helloworld.com/index.html",
 2
      "name": "Hello world application",
 3
      "manifest_version": "v1.0",
 4
      "description": "",
 5
 6
      "contents": [
 7
        {
          "seq": 0,
 8
          "type": "inline",
 9
          "load": "sync",
10
          "hash": "sha256-XT0yF1DRjbn5ymbnsasJnag4+53huda0TZ3bRPIcrAA=",
11
12
          "dynamic": false,
          "trust": "assert"
13
14
        }
15
16
    }
```



- Each active content metadata must have a trust declaration
- The compliance check method is decided based on trust value



- Trust values : assert
 - The developer provides hash of active content and asserts that it behaves as intended



- Trust values : assert
 - The developer provides hash of active content and asserts that it behaves as intended
 - Measurement compliance check :
 - Compare the delivered hash against the hash in the manifest



- Trust values : assert
 - The developer provides hash of active content and asserts that it behaves as intended
 - Measurement compliance check :
 - Compare the delivered hash against the hash in the manifest
 - Case studies :



- Trust values : assert
 - The developer provides hash of active content and asserts that it behaves as intended
 - Measurement compliance check :
 - Compare the delivered hash against the hash in the manifest
 - Case studies :
 - Self contained applications : WhatsApp web



- Trust values : assert
 - The developer provides hash of active content and asserts that it behaves as intended
 - Measurement compliance check :
 - Compare the delivered hash against the hash in the manifest
 - Case studies :
 - Self contained applications : WhatsApp web
 - Developer vouches for their own content



- Trust values : assert
 - The developer provides hash of active content and asserts that it behaves as intended
 - Measurement compliance check :
 - Compare the delivered hash against the hash in the manifest
 - Case studies :
 - Self contained applications : WhatsApp web
 - Developer vouches for their own content
 - Trusted third party code : JQuery



- Trust values : assert
 - The developer provides hash of active content and asserts that it behaves as intended
 - Measurement compliance check :
 - Compare the delivered hash against the hash in the manifest
 - Case studies :
 - Self contained applications : WhatsApp web
 - Developer vouches for their own content
 - Trusted third party code : JQuery
 - Developer pins the third-party code to a precise version that was audited



- Trust values : delegate
 - The developer refers the trust to the third-party that provides the element



- Trust values : delegate
 - The developer refers the trust to the third-party that provides the element
 - Now the third party is taking the responsibility for this code



- Trust values : delegate
 - The developer refers the trust to the third-party that provides the element
 - Now the third party is taking the responsibility for this code
 - The developer doesn't want to vouch for the third-party



- Trust values : delegate
 - The developer refers the trust to the third-party that provides the element
 - Now the third party is taking the responsibility for this code
 - The developer doesn't want to vouch for the third-party
 - Or she always wants to use the latest version



- Trust values : delegate
 - The developer refers the trust to the third-party that provides the element
 - Now the third party is taking the responsibility for this code
 - The developer doesn't want to vouch for the third-party
 - Or she always wants to use the latest version
 - Case study :
 - The third-party willing to vouch for their code : Nimiq Wallet





- Trust values : blind-trust
 - The developer blindly trusts the active content without identifying the code



- Trust values : blind-trust
 - The developer blindly trusts the active content without identifying the code
 - The developer is responsible to properly sandbox that code



- Trust values : blind-trust
 - The developer blindly trusts the active content without identifying the code
 - The developer is responsible to properly sandbox that code
 - Measurement compliance check :
 - Compare delivered sandbox against the sandbox in manifest


- Trust values : blind-trust
 - The developer blindly trusts the active content without identifying the code
 - The developer is responsible to properly sandbox that code
 - Measurement compliance check :
 - Compare delivered sandbox against the sandbox in manifest
 - Case study :
 - The third-party code through Adbidding blind-trusted :
 - Adsense (blind-trust + sandbox) + Nimiq Wallet (delegate)



- Trust values : blind-trust
 - The developer blindly trusts the active content without identifying the code
 - The developer is responsible to properly sandbox that code
 - Measurement compliance check :
 - Compare delivered sandbox against the sandbox in manifest
 - Case study :
 - The third-party code through Adbidding blind-trusted :
 - Adsense (blind-trust + sandbox) + Nimiq Wallet (delegate)



- Trust values : blind-trust
 - The developer blindly trusts the active content without identifying the code
 - The developer is responsible to properly sandbox that code
 - Measurement compliance check :
 - Compare delivered sandbox against the sandbox in manifest
 - Case study :
 - The third-party code through Adbidding blind-trusted :
 - Adsense (blind-trust + sandbox) + Nimiq Wallet (delegate)
 - Adsense (blind-trust) + Nimiq Wallet (delegate + sandbox)



• Content scripts collect active content metadata





• Compliance check : measures the active content and compares w/ manifest





- Compatibility and performance analysis on the case studies
- How much does Accountable JS extension affect page load time?
 - Lighthouse metrics :
 - Time until browser paints the first pixel,
 - Total blocking time



Evaluation results

Case study	First pixel		Total blocking time	
	Baseline	Accountable JS	Baseline	Accountable JS
Trusted third-party (JQuery)	462	+21	0	+0
Delegate trust (Nimiq Wallet)	262	- 10	172	+87
Untrusted third-party (Adsense + Nimiq Wallet)	747	+91	159	+77
	Total page load			
	Baseline	Code Veri	ify Accountable JS	
WhatsApp Web	204	+16		+40

- Baseline is all extensions disabled
- All numbers are in milliseconds
- Change below 100 ms is considered imperceptible



- Content Security Policy (CSP)
 - List of valid sources



- Content Security Policy (CSP)
 - List of valid sources
 - Unknown resources denied



- Content Security Policy (CSP)
 - List of valid sources
 - Unknown resources denied
 - 8 No accountability



- Content Security Policy (CSP)
 - List of valid sources
 - Unknown resources denied
 - 8 No accountability
 - 8 Not designed to know the order of resources in the webpage
 - Resource A loaded before B might mean something different from B then A
 - This can be used for microtargeting



- Content Security Policy (CSP)
 - List of valid sources
 - Unknown resources denied
 - 😵 No accountability
 - 8 Not designed to know the order of resources in the webpage
 - Resource A loaded before B might mean something different than B then A
 - This can be used for microtargeting
 - 8 No delegation support





- Code Verify from Meta
 - Likewise implementing accountability for active content





- Code Verify from Meta
 - Likewise implementing accountability for active content
 - 8 Manifest is hashed not signed -> no accountability



- Code Verify from Meta
 - Likewise implementing accountability for active content
 - 8 Manifest is hashed not signed -> no accountability
 - 8 No history of versions -> no transparency
 - Public cannot know how often the versions change



• Accountable JS



• Accountable JS

improve the trust on security-critical websites



- Accountable JS
 - improve the trust on security-critical websites
 - enhance security by deterrence



- Accountable JS
 - improve the trust on security-critical websites
 - enhance security by deterrence
 - increase transparency
 - public can see how their data is used



- Accountable JS
 - improve the trust on security-critical websites
 - enhance security by deterrence
 - increase transparency
 - public can see how their data is used
 - become part of the browsers some day





• What will you find in the paper?



- What will you find in the paper?
 - Details about Accountable JS protocol flow



- What will you find in the paper?
 - Details about Accountable JS protocol flow
 - Case studies and evaluations on CSP and Code Verify



- What will you find in the paper?
 - Details about Accountable JS protocol flow
 - Case studies and evaluations on CSP and Code Verify
 - Threat model and assumptions



- What will you find in the paper?
 - Details about Accountable JS protocol flow
 - Case studies and evaluations on CSP and Code Verify
 - Threat model and assumptions
 - Protocol verification details
 - Automated protocol verification : Tamarin and SAPIC



• Thank you very much



• Active content types





• Execution order and static-dynamic content





- Security protocol
 - Establish security guarantees \rightarrow formal methods



- Security protocol
 - Establish security guarantees \rightarrow formal methods
- Analysed with Tamarin Prover + SAPIC





Accountable JS

- Authentication of origin
- Transparency
- Accountability
- End-to-end guarantee

Code Verify

- Authentication of origin
- Non-accountability
- End-to-end guarantee

Authentication of origin : The client executes active content only if the corresponding manifest was generated by the honest developer unless the developer is corrupted (or Cloudflare in CV), Transparency : If the client executes code then its manifest is present in a transparency log, Accountability : When the public accepts a claim, then even if the client was corrupted, the code must exist in the logs and the server must have sent that data Non-accountability : The data provided to the client is not sufficient to prove they received certain content from the web server, even if web server and Cloudflare are honest. End-to-end guarantee : Only by corrupting the developer it is possible to distribute malicious code.



- Accountability and authentication of origin
 - A client executes the code only if it was made public by the developer



- Accountability and authentication of origin
 - A client executes the code only if it was made public by the developer
- Non-repudiation of reception
 - A client wants to present false claim about the executed code



- Accountability and authentication of origin
 - A client executes the code only if it was made public by the developer
- Non-repudiation of reception
 - A client wants to present false claim about the executed code
- Accountability of latest version
 - A client wants to ensure he is delivered the latest code



- Accountability and authentication of origin
 - A client executes the code only if it was made public by the developer
- Non-repudiation of reception
 - A client wants to present false claim about the executed code
- Accountability of latest version
 - A client wants to ensure he is delivered the latest code

Security properties of the Code Verify are discussed in the paper


- Clients can verify they received the latest and the same version of the code as any other user
- Public append-only log:
 - Trusted, efficient, available
 - Provides non-equivocation
 - Third-party auditors and monitors keep it honest
- Trillian : allows to prove append operations efficiently
 - Misbehaviour can be detected by trusted public auditors or by honest logs distributing such proofs (with gossiping)

Transparency logs – availability, scalability

- Use load balancing, avoid single point of failure
- Stapling method decreases the number of requests to the log
- Websites that frequently update active content:

Websites that frequently update their active contents can create significant burden on the log size. We calculate approximately how many times each log can be updated for a limited time and space. We assume a non-leaf node overhead is approximately 100 bytes and for the leaf nodes it is 700 bytes(signature 600 bytes + 100 bytes). If a log provider has 100 TB of space for 5 years, it can contain 137 billion signatures in total. To make sense of this number, take the following example. We start with a log of 10M URLs with eight updates per month on average. The number of URLs also increases exponentially at a rate of 1% with each update (i.e. also eight times per month). ⁵ This number would be well below 137 billion signatures.



- Active content injected by other browser extensions
- Data only attacks
 - e.g. modified button labels or redirect form URLs, change recipient's wallet address during payment transaction



• Code stapling





• Code delivery

$$\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline Client & \hline Web \ Server \\ \hline n & \leftarrow \end{tabular} \end{tabular} \{0,1\}^\lambda \ sign(sk_C, \langle n, URL \rangle) \\ \hline sig_W & := sign(sk_W, \langle HTML', n, sig_L \rangle) \\ \hline 1) \ (\varphi', v') & := measure(HTML') \\ 2) \ verif(pk_W, sig_W, \langle HTML', n, sig_L \rangle) \\ \hline 3) \ verif(pk_L, sig_L, \langle \varphi', v', URL \rangle)) \\ \hline \end{tabular}$$