LAUR-06-1737

Invited talk for the National Security Institute's IMPACT06 Security Conference, Falls Church, VA April 3-5, 2006.

How to Conduct an Adversarial Vulnerability Assessment

Roger G. Johnston, Ph.D., CPP Vulnerability Assessment Team Los Alamos National Laboratory 505-667-7414 <u>rogerj@lanl.gov</u> http://pearl1.lanl.gov/seals































































































































Warning: Polygraphs



National Academy of Sciences \$860,000 study: "The Polygraph and Lie Detection" (October 2002) http://www.nap.edu/books/0309084369/html/

Some Conclusions:

"Polygraph test accuracy may be degraded by countermeasures..."

"...overconfidence in the polygraph—a belief in its accuracy that goes beyond what is justified by the evidence—...presents a danger to national security..."

"Its accuracy in distinguishing actual or potential security violators from innocent test takers is insufficient to justify reliance on its use in employee security screening..."





Warning: Multiple Layers of Security ("Security in Depth")
Multiple layers of bad security do not add up to good security.
Tends to be a cop-out to avoid improving security.
Leads to complacency.
Some layers may not counter the insider threat. Example: fences.
Some layers are not backups for others. Example: tamper-indicating seals & fences.















How Flawed is Your Security Program? Take Our Test!

You're penalized 1 point for each of the following 45 attributes that generally apply to your security program. Total up your overall score.

<u>Total points</u>	Rating
0-2	a top-notch security program
3-6	significant room for improvement
7-14	not a healthy security program
15-22	Keystone Cops
23+	Maybe Moo Burger needs a new Assistant Manager?

45 Attributes of Flawed Security Programs

- 1. Widespread arrogance & overconfidence.
- 2. Security is viewed as binary. (This inhibits improvement.)
- 3. Insiders are not viewed as a threat.
- 4. Overly focused on paperwork, auditors, regulations, & formality.
- 5. Security & security managers are micromanaged by unqualified business executives.

Attributes of Flawed Security Programs (con't)

- 6. Security personnel are not encouraged to think on the job, or to ask questions and raise concerns.
- 7. Security personnel are reluctant to report problems or security incidents.
- 8. Security problems, vulnerabilities, & incidents are covered-up by security managers.
- 9. Serious vulnerabilities are assumed not to exist.

Attributes of Flawed Security Programs (con't)

- 10. Comments, suggestions, and criticisms concerning security are unwelcome from any quarter (internal or external) and result in retaliation, undue defensiveness, or automatic knee-jerk rejection of the input.
- 11. Creative, comprehensive, holistic vulnerability assessment are rare; security is rarely tested. "Vulnerability assessments" don't find significant vulnerabilities or result in substantial changes.





















How Flawed is Your Security Program? Take Our Test! You're penalized 1 point for each of the following 45 attributes that generally apply to your security program. Total up your overall score. **Total points** Rating 0-2 a top-notch security program 3-6 significant room for improvement 7-14 not a healthy security program 15-22 Keystone Cops 23 +Maybe Moo Burger needs a new Assistant Manager?



	Other Issues Covered on the CD	
m	Q: A:	Can AVA techniques be used to improve safety, not just security? "Adversarial" Safety Analysis
o r e	Q: A:	How, to whom, and in what detail do you disclose security vulnerabilities that affect others? Vulnerability Disclosure Index (0-100%)
i	Q: A:	How can we reduce security guard turnover? Tools from Industrial/Organizational Psychology
n f o	Q: A:	How can cargo security be improved? Better tamper-indicating seals, use protocols, and new cargo monitoring techniques
	Q: A:	How can we counter pharmaceutical counterfeiting w/o RFIDs (which don't provide security or involve consumers)? Numeric tokens