### TrustFabric

# A guide to applying the Claimant Model



The **Claimant Model** is a formal framework to describe what's important to log and who will verify its contents. This presentation uses a fictional scenario to show how to fill in the canvas, step-by-step.

At the end is a template canvas you can use to complete a Claimant Model for your domain. Hopefully you have tried answering <u>these questions</u> first to help you examine and clarify the design of your verifiable system.

CLAIMANT PhoneCo	Claimant Model Canvas Project name: PhoneCo verifiable log					BELIEVER Phone update app
STATEMENT { "manifest": { "hash": "ab23fe", "usersian": "1 2 5"	CLAIM The Has <cryptographic hash X&gt;</cryptographic 	e update described b Is unique for the specified version <y></y>	y this manifest: Is functionally correct and without known attack vectors			ACTION Installs update
"version": "1.2.5" }, "signature": "fde637" }	VERIFIER checks hashes against release log	checks all version numbers are unique	analyses update for malware			ARBITERS – PhoneCo security team – Regulator
	PhoneCo security team	PhoneCo security team	Security company			<ul> <li>Tech press</li> <li>Security companies</li> </ul>

### **THE SCENARIO**

- PhoneCo makes smartphones. They release software updates every month.
- When they publish software updates, they sign them with a private key.
- When their customers' update app gets a new software update, it checks the signature came from PhoneCo.
- The phone updater app doesn't install an update without a valid signature.

### **THE SCENARIO**

- One of PhoneCo's competitors private key gets stolen and used to release malicious updates.
- PhoneCo want to protect themselves against that scenario and have designed a way for a verifiable log to do that.

We'll document PhoneCo's verifiable system using the **Claimant Model canvas.** 

# PhoneCo decide to start logging a manifest every time they release a new genuine software update.

# It contains the version number and a cryptographic hash of the update:

```
{
    "manifest": {
        "hash": "ab23fe...",
        "version": "1.2.5"
    },
    "signature": "fde637..."
}
```

### The phone updater app will look in the log for a matching manifest before installing any updates.

### By signing and putting this data in a log, PhoneCo is making a **claim**...

The update described by this manifest:

- 1. Has <cryptographic hash X>
- 2. Is unique for the specified version <Y>
- 3. Is functionally correct and without known attack vectors

... that the phone update app **believes** is true in order to perform an **action**, install an update.

### Now we can fill in some of the canvas:

CLAIMANT PhoneCo	A Claimant makes a Claim that is relied upon by a Believer.					BELIEVER Phone update app	
STATEMENT	CLAIM The update described by this manifest:					ACTION	1
{ "manifest": { "hash": "ab23fe", "version": "1.2.5" }, "signature": "fde637" }	Has <cryptographic hash X&gt;</cryptographic 	Is unique for the specified version <y></y>	Is functionally correct and without known attack vectors			Installs update	
				Believe on this (	ers take a Claim tha take if it v	an <b>Action</b> base at they would r was false.	ed 10t

Now we can fill in some of the canvas:



# At this point, PhoneCo are putting things in a log, but nothing else.

This isn't enough to solve PhoneCo's problem. If their private keys were stolen, a malicious actor could still release a bad update and publish a fake manifest to the log.

## In order to rely on the data in the log, everything must be verified. We need to consider who can verify the claims in the log.

### In this case, there are several parts to each claim. Each part needs to be **verified**.

CLAIM The update described by this manifest:							
Has <cryptographic hash X&gt;</cryptographic 	Is unique for the specified version <y></y>	Is functionally correct and without known attack vectors					

### For each part of the claim, PhoneCo asked themselves who is in an authoritative position to verify that part.

# Only PhoneCo can authoritatively say if a particular hash in a log entry was a genuine release.

#### CLAIM

The update described by this manifest has <cryptographic hash X> VERIFIER

PhoneCo security team

GOOGLE TRUSTFABRIC | THE CLAIMANT MODEL

### Anyone could check whether a version number appeared in multiple log entries. PhoneCo's security team takes on this responsibility.

CLAIM

The update described by this manifest is unique for the specified version <Y> VERIFIER

PhoneCo security team

GOOGLE TRUSTFABRIC | THE CLAIMANT MODEL

### A third-party security company could analyse each software update for malicious code and attack vectors.

#### CLAIM

The update described by this manifest is functionally correct and without known attack vectors

#### VERIFIER

Security company

## We can now add the verifiers to the canvas:

CLAIMANT PhoneCo						BELIEVER Phone update app
STATEMENT	CLAIM Th	e update described b	y this manifest:			ACTION
{ "manifest": { "hash": "ab23fe", "version": "1.2.5"	Has <cryptographic hash X&gt;</cryptographic 	Is unique for the specified version <y></y>	Is functionally correct and without known attack vectors	A	•	Installs update
}, "signature": "fde637" }	VERIFIER checks hashes against release log	checks all version numbers are unique	analyses update for malware			
	PhoneCo security team	PhoneCo security team	Security company			

# Finally, PhoneCo thinks about what action should be taken if verifiers discover a malicious entry.

## Without this, there are no consequences of malicious actions. It still doesn't solve PhoneCo's problem as a malicious manifest may be detected but would still be installed.

### If PhoneCo's security team spots a manifest with an unrecognised hash, they assume their private key has been stolen, and rotate their keys.



### If PhoneCo's security team spots a duplicated version number, they assume their private key has been stolen, and rotate their keys.



### If a third-party security company found malware in PhoneCo's update, they could tell the tech press and regulators.



CLAIMANT PhoneCo	Claimant Model Canvas Project name: PhoneCo verifiable log				BELIEVER Phone update app
STATEMENT { "manifest": { "hash": "ab23fe", "version": "1.2.5" }, "signature": "fde637" }	CLAIM Th Has <cryptographic hash X&gt;</cryptographic 	e update described b Is unique for the specified version <y></y>	y this manifest: Is functionally correct and without known attack vectors		ACTION Installs update
	VERIFIER checks hashes against release log	checks all version numbers are unique	analyses update for malware		ARBITERS – PhoneCo security team – Regulator
	PhoneCo security team	PhoneCo security team	Security company		<ul> <li>Tech press</li> <li>Security</li> <li>companies</li> </ul>

All software updates are logged, every manifest is verified continually, and there's a plan for verifiers to take action if they discover a malicious manifest. Now, if PhoneCo's private key was stolen, a malicious update would be detected since all manifests are continually verified. Use this process to document your own system using the **Claimant Model Canvas.** 

CLAIMANT	TrustFabric Claim	BELIEVER				
	Project name	:				
STATEMENT	CLAIM	ACTION				
		A	•	•	•	
	VERIFIER	-				ARBITERS