

Yoneda Hacking: The Algebra of Attacker Actions

Georgios Bakirtzis, Fabrizio Genovese, and Cody H. Fleming

Abstract—Our work focuses on modeling security of systems from their component-level designs. Towards this goal we develop a *categorical* formalism to model attacker actions. Equipping the categorical formalism with algebras produces two interesting results for security modeling. First, using the Yoneda lemma, we are able to model attacker reconnaissance missions. In this context, the Yoneda lemma formally shows us that if two system representations, one being complete and the other being the attacker's incomplete view, agree at every possible test, then they behave the same. The implication is that attackers can still successfully exploit the system even with incomplete information. Second, we model the possible changes that can occur to the system via an exploit. An exploit either manipulates the interactions between system components, for example, providing the wrong values to a sensor, or changes the components themselves, for example, manipulating the firmware of a global positioning system (GPS). One additional benefit of using category theory is that mathematical operations can be represented as formal diagrams, which is useful for applying this analysis in a model-based design setting. We illustrate this modeling framework using a cyber-physical system model of an unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV). We demonstrate and model two types of attacks (1) a rewiring attack, which violates data integrity, and (2) a rewriting attack, which violates availability.

Index Terms—Abstract algebra, category theory, cyber-physical systems (CPS), security, systems modeling.

1 INTRODUCTION

IN the past decade there has been significant effort in adding formal underpinnings to security [1], [2]. This research trajectory is evidenced by the NSF/IARPA/NSA workshop on the science of security, which underlines that there are three areas in need of innovation: metrics, formal methods, and experimentation [3]. In addition, there is still increasing need for defining (in)security as a modeling problem [4], [5], [6]. This paper develops a *formal method* for modeling attacker actions at the abstraction level of component-level system models. Specifically, the categorical result of the Yoneda lemma is used to formally show that if two different architectural implementations of a system agree on every test, then they are behaviorally equivalent. The implication of this result is that an attacker can still effectively exploit a system, even with an inaccurate knowledge base of the architecture, using rewiring and/or rewriting attacks.

Security engineering has moved from the paradigm of securing a list of assets to modeling in graphs of networked components, which is more congruent with attacker behavior [7]. These graphs are useful for analyzing the system's security posture [8]; however, we can improve them further using added structure that comes with categorical models of component-level system models, which are by definition compositional; a useful property for security modeling [9]. The functorial semantics that come with this category-theoretic modeling framework also explicitly relate several views that are essential for the modeling and analysis of cyber-physical systems (CPS), where continuous and discrete behaviors interrelate to produce a total behavior. The following formal method is applicable to information tech-

nology (IT) systems too but the added complexity of CPS is useful as a demonstration and to examine formally, in the future, how attacks can lead to hazards and misbehaviors.

Particularly, this structure comes in the form of formal decomposition rules between *system behavior* and *system architecture*, which improves upon current practice where system behavior is disjoint from system architecture. Additionally, this approach provides for *early* security modeling, where engineering decisions are most effective [10], [11], by operating on models instead of implementations. This is possible because categorical semantics reside in a higher level of abstraction than, for example, attack graphs [12], which work best after source code is available. The implementation of this category-theoretic modeling method is what allows us to use the Yoneda lemma to show the impact of exploitable vulnerabilities from an attacker perspective over a system model, which can be incomplete or even partially erroneous compared to the system under attack.

We develop algebras describing behaviors (block diagrams) and architectures (graphs) and security operations. That is, we formalize in a precise way both diagrammatic reasoning as well as how these differing views of the system (behavior and architecture and attacker actions) are unified. This categorical formalization of diagrammatic reasoning has found success in, for example, manipulating quantum processes [13], [14] and databases [15]. We posit a similar innovation would be useful in defining a high level interpretation of attacker actions diagrammatically. This categorical interpretation formalizes two attacker actions; learning and hijacking. While this framework does not examine particular attacks by itself, attack pattern databases (for example MITRE CAPEC [16]) and attacker modeling frameworks (for example MITRE ATT&CK [17]) can be used to augment the model with concrete examples of attacker actions.

G. Bakirtzis and F. Genovese contributed equally.
G. Bakirtzis (bakirtzis@virginia.edu) is with the University of Virginia.
F. Genovese (fabrizio.genovese@roninstitute.org) is with the Ronin Institute.
C.H. Fleming (flemingc@iastate.edu) is with Iowa State University.

This paper attempts to develop the foundations of security within a *compositional CPS theory* modeling framework [18], a flavor of what Lee calls dynamical computational systems theory [19]. Formal composition rules could overcome some of the new challenges CPS introduce to security [20], [21]. Specifically our contributions are in the domain of formal methods for security to assist model-based design of CPS using category theory. These contributions are still bound by well-known problems of the foundations and general *science of security*, such as the lack of a well-defined common language [22].

- Describing how fundamental concepts in category theory, such as functors to the category of sets, can be interpreted as testing procedures, and results like the Yoneda lemma can be used to infer similarities between systems given the similarities between their test outcomes.
- Directly using these insights to model the most common phases of an attack, that consist of learning first, and on the attack itself afterwards, thereby modeling from the attacker perspective formally.
- Extending the approach to CPS by wiring diagrams and their algebras [11], termed systems-as-algebras, to provide compelling examples of how our mathematical formalization works in practice, which gives rise to a categorical formal methods for CPS security.

A concrete future result of this line of theoretical work would be the integration of security primitives within systems modeling languages, which will be important for assuring that CPS models conform to security requirements. We show in a guided process how this would be achieved by modeling a rewiring attack and a component attack on an unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) and how both attacks can be represented diagrammatically as formal methods.

2 PROBLEM FORMULATION

Having fixed some system, by an *attack* we mean any procedure intended to change the system behavior. This definition is very broad, and ranges from privilege escalation in a computer system to sabotaging a car. We consider an *attacker* any actor who performs any such process to degrade a systems behavior.

Traditionally, attacking a system is considered to be an art, and as such it requires a certain degree of heuristics. Our goal is to formalize these heuristics mathematically, using the attacker point of view.

From an intuitive standpoint, it makes sense to divide an attack into two distinct phases: *learning*, where the attacker gathers information about the target system in the hope to find a weakness, and *hijacking*, where the attacker leverages on a given weakness changing the behavior of some component, which reverberates on the system as a whole. The particulars of how these phases are exercised and how they feedback with each other depend on the capabilities and goal of the attacker (in defender terms this would be detailed in the threat model).

To model the first phase, we need a mathematical description of what probing a system for information means. To model the second phase, we need to mathematically

express the fact that the attacker can act on a system to change it.

Crucially, there is an intermediate step between these two phases, which we do not describe. We do not describe explicitly how the weakness is turned into an exploiting procedure to change the behavior of some subsystem. Instead, we only describe how the weakness is found, and how the exploiting procedure reverberates in the system as a whole. The reason why this assumption is acceptable is twofold. First, turning a weakness into a viable exploit is heavily dependent on implementation details, for example, the Spectre and Meltdown exploits [23], and our mathematical framework is too general to capture these details successfully. Second, the largest class of attacker actions involves already developed exploits, either internally or through a marketplace, deployed in some sequence to degrade the behavior of the system, without necessarily the attacker precisely knowing how they work [24].

For instance, an attacker may find out by testing (Phase 1) that a given laptop uses some particular model of WiFi card. The attacker can then purchase – if it exists – an exploit for the given card, and deploy it. At this point, the behavior of the system as a whole will change (Phase 2), for example by giving to the attacker the possibility to run any code on the machine. This example is taken straight out of real experience [25].

Importantly, we make the claim that an attacker is able to hijack a system even having an incomplete view of it, as long as the system and the mental model of it from the attacker point of view are behaviorally equivalent. Mathematically, this relies on the assumption that the exploit being used is invariant under isomorphism of behavior.

ASSUMPTIONS In practice, this means the following: we represent behaviors of systems using the concept of *categorical semantics* (Section 4). This categorical semantics can be more or less granular, depending on how low-level we want our descriptions to be. For instance, consider specifying behavior in terms of automata. We can represent automata as theoretical objects, but we can also take into account their implementation details, meaning that we not only describe the system behavior under some formalism but are also able to relate it to concrete elements; as a reductionist example, an automaton can be implemented in either a system-on-chip or a field-programmable gate array (FPGA). These would amount to different choices of categorical semantics.

Two automata may be isomorphic in the former setting but not in the latter: this could result in having two different implementations of the same theoretical concept (e.g., this is the case in considering the same automaton implemented in two different programming languages). An attack exploiting the automaton design will be isomorphism-invariant in both settings: such an attack exploits the idea that it is possible to start from a state of a given automaton and end up in another state via a legitimate sequence of moves. An attack exploiting the automaton implementation (e.g. some weakness of the programming language the automaton is implemented in) will be isomorphism-invariant only in the latter setting: at the theoretical level, our categorical semantics simply is not able to “see” implementation differences.

This is important, because it amounts to saying that

“an attack can be carried out even if the attacker has an erroneous view of the system, as long as it is behaviorally equivalent to the system itself” holds only if the categorical semantics developed for application is granular enough to faithfully model the level of generality on which a given exploit acts.

3 CATEGORICAL PRELIMINARIES

The main mathematical tools used to build the proposed compositional modeling framework for cybersecurity in CPS are: a compositional *system model* in the wiring diagram category; the Yoneda lemma which represents *tests over the system model*, and more specifically the Yoneda lemma fully determines a given object by its relationships [26]; and finally functors and natural transformations to investigate formally the *effects of an exploit*.

Category theory has been used to model information security from a largely theoretical stance [27], [28]. In this work we extend the theoretical contributions from applied category theory to security assessment for CPS models. Because of the relatively new developments within the category theory community to move towards applications, we do not assume any knowledge of category theory. Instead we start by introducing the notion of a category, develop intuition for functors and natural transformations, and present the Yoneda lemma. All the category theory covered in this paper is considered standard and will be found in any introductory book on the subject, such as Lawvere and Schanuel [29] or Leinster [30]. The categorical results are used to develop algebraic machinery such that it is possible to model security violations over a CPS model.

The one assumption we make is that there is an already existent model of a CPS that is translated or built in categorical terms. The motivation for this assumption is twofold. First, through category theory it is possible to unify behavioral models of control systems with models of candidate concrete implementation of this behavior. This allows us to use the categorical formalism to trace between and within these different but important views in the design of CPS. Second, as it pertains to security assessment it is helpful to see the effects of an attack at the behavioral level, even though most security assessment techniques apply to implementations. This relationship is often built in the intuition of the security analyst. By having a categorical systems model we are able to capture formally and, therefore, precisely the possible effects of an attack from the particular modeled implementation to the set of control behaviors.

We acknowledge that this assumption contains limitations (Section 6), including that often systems are modeled after the fact in a largely informal manner. However, we posit that to move the goal post towards a compositional CPS *theory* as defined in the introduction, we must move towards more formal treatment of both systems modeling and security analysis. Category theory is but one possible formalism towards this direction but has shown promise because it can relate and transform between different model types, which is an important attribute that promotes and merges already existing approaches from the areas of control, systems theory, and security instead of requiring new developments in formalisms in each individual area.

This view is consistent with the concerns of industry. Often, unified languages are reductionist in practice, causing increased complexity and lower fidelity of models [31]. However, the categorical framework we develop here (and by others in the area of dynamical systems, for example, by Spivak and Tan [32]) results in the ability to translate between already known and used models. In fact, the actual categorical formalism could be in the backend of a modeling language without the system designer or security analyst having to interact with any unfamiliar syntax.

3.1 Categories

Category theory is a framework to study patterns in mathematics. The fundamental definition is the one of a category.

Definition 1. A category \mathcal{C} is composed of:

- A collection of *objects*, denoted $\text{obj } \mathcal{C}$;
- For each pair of objects A, B , a collection of *morphisms from A to B* , denoted $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}[A, B]$. A morphism f in $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}[A, B]$ is usually denoted as $A \xrightarrow{f} B$;
- For each object A , a morphism $A \xrightarrow{\text{id}_A} A$;
- For each A, B, C objects, an operation

$$\circ_{A,B,C} : \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}[B, C] \times \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}[A, B] \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}[A, C]$$

called *composition*. We usually omit the subscripts and just write $g \circ f$ to denote composition. Composition is also denoted diagrammatically, as in $A \xrightarrow{f} B \xrightarrow{g} C$.

- Finally, we require the following equations to hold for each $A \xrightarrow{f} B, B \xrightarrow{g} C$ and $C \xrightarrow{h} D$:

$$\text{id}_B \circ f = f \quad f \circ \text{id}_A = f \quad (h \circ g) \circ f = h \circ (g \circ f)$$

The interpretation we give to categories is the following: Objects can represent systems, states of a given system or in general entities we care about. Morphisms represent transformations between these entities. The axioms amount to asking that:

- For each system A there is a “do nothing” transformation, called id_A ;
- We can compose transformations whenever their domain and codomain match. This captures the idea of applying transformations *sequentially*, each transformation acting on the result of the previous one. We require this composition to be associative.

Example 1. The simplest example of category in this context is **Set**, the category whose objects are sets and morphisms are functions between them. For each set A , id_A is the identity function from A to itself; composition is function composition.


Example 2. Plenty of familiar structures in mathematics can be seen as categories. For instance, a monoid can be seen as a category with only one object, call it $*$. Any element of the monoid is interpreted as a morphism $* \rightarrow *$. The identity on $*$ is the monoid unit, and composition is the monoid operation. Indeed, categories can be thought of as generalized monoids with many objects.

Other familiar examples of categories include: groups and their homomorphisms, vector spaces and linear maps between them, topological spaces and continuous functions, and the category of states and transitions between them [33].

In general, the idea is that morphisms are transformations that preserve some properties possessed by the objects, properties that we care about. So, for instance, if we were to define a category of topological spaces, we may require morphisms to be continuous functions or homotopies, and if we define a category whose objects are algebras we may require the morphisms to be homomorphisms that preserve the relevant algebraic properties we want to study.

What happens when two objects, with respect to the properties we are interested in, behave exactly in the same way? This notion can be categorified as:

Definition 2. Given a category \mathcal{C} , a morphism $A \xrightarrow{f} B$ is called an *isomorphism* if there is a morphism $B \xrightarrow{f^{-1}} A$ such that the following square *commutes*, meaning that any two paths sharing the same start and end points define the same morphism:



If there is an isomorphism $A \xrightarrow{f} B$, then we say that A and B are *isomorphic*, and write $A \simeq B$.

Remark. Importantly, two isomorphic objects in a category behave exactly in the same way *only* with respect to the structure captured by the category. For instance, \mathbb{R} and \mathbb{R}^2 can be seen both as objects in **Set**, the category of sets and functions, and as objects in **Vect_ℝ**, the category of real vector spaces and linear maps between them. They are isomorphic in **Set**, since bijective functions satisfy Definition 2 and \mathbb{R} and \mathbb{R}^2 are in bijection. Nevertheless, they are *not* isomorphic in **Vect_ℝ**, since an isomorphism in this category has to be a *linear* bijection, which in particular has to preserve dimension. What is happening here is that since **Vect_ℝ** keeps track of more structure than what **Set** does, our ability to tell objects apart in **Vect_ℝ** is *finer* than in **Set**.

3.2 Functors

Functors are morphisms between categories. As we said in the previous section, they should then preserve the properties we care about when we study categories. Looking at Definition 1, these are just identities and composition. Hence, we give the following definition.

Definition 3. Given categories \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D} , a functor $\mathcal{C} \xrightarrow{F} \mathcal{D}$ consists of the following information:

- A mapping $\text{obj } \mathcal{C} \xrightarrow{F} \text{obj } \mathcal{D}$;

- For each $A, B \in \text{obj } \mathcal{C}$, a mapping

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}[A, B] \xrightarrow{F} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{D}}[FA, FB]$$

- We moreover require the following equations to hold:

$$F(\text{id}_A) = \text{id}_{FA} \quad F(g \circ f) = F(g) \circ F(f)$$

Functors are structure preserving maps that allow us to connect different model types by defining the particular semantics of transformations that are necessary to change the domain of discourse (within a particular category, say $\mathbf{Set} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$, or between different categories, say $\mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$).

Remark. In category theory practice it is customary to omit parentheses when not strictly necessary. As such, we will often write Ff instead of $F(f)$ to denote the application of a functor F to a morphism f .

Example 3. There is a functor from **Vect_ℝ** to **Set** that “forgets structure”: Any real vector space is mapped to its underlying set, and any linear map between them is mapped to its underlying function between sets.

Example 4. As we will see shortly, a very important functor in category theory is the hom-functor: Fix an object A in a category \mathcal{C} . Then we can define a functor

$$\mathcal{C} \xrightarrow{\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}[A, -]} \mathbf{Set}$$

Which sends every object B of \mathcal{C} to the set of morphisms $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}[A, B]$. A morphism $B \xrightarrow{g} C$ is sent to the function

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}[A, B] \xrightarrow{\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}[A, g]} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}[A, C]$$

Which acts by postcomposing: a morphism $A \xrightarrow{f} B$ is sent to $A \xrightarrow{f} B \xrightarrow{g} C$. Functoriality follows from the composition and identity axioms of \mathcal{C} .

Functors are also useful to supply a category with an additional operation alongside \circ , which intuitively models the idea of considering multiple objects at the same time and performing transformations *in parallel*.

Definition 4. A *monoidal* category \mathcal{V} is a category that comes equipped with a *monoidal product functor*

$$\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V} \xrightarrow{\otimes} \mathcal{V}$$

which can be thought of as multiplication of objects and morphisms, or more broadly as doing operations in parallel. We require that, for any objects X, Y, Z ,

$$(X \otimes Y) \otimes Z \simeq X \otimes (Y \otimes Z)$$

Meaning that multiplying objects in any order gives isomorphic results.

We also require the existence of a distinguished object I of \mathcal{V} , called *monoidal unit*, such that

$$I \otimes X \simeq X \simeq X \otimes I$$

that is, I acts like an identity for this multiplication. All this data must satisfy certain axioms [34], that are beyond the scope of this paper.

Example 5. Widely used examples of monoidal categories include $(\mathbf{Set}, \times, \{\star\})$, with the cartesian product of sets

and the singleton, as well as $(\mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{R}}, \otimes, \mathbb{R})$, with the tensor product of vector spaces. Moreover **Cat**, the *category of categories and functors between them*, admits a monoidal structure $(\mathbf{Cat}, \times, \mathbf{1})$, where tensor is defined as the cartesian product of categories (similarly to that of sets), and the tensor unit is the category **1** consisting of a single object together with its identity arrow.

In fact, all these are examples of *symmetric* monoidal categories, which come further equipped with isomorphisms

$$X \otimes Y \simeq Y \otimes X.$$

For example, for two sets it is $X \times Y \simeq Y \times X$ via the mapping $(x, y) \mapsto (y, x)$.

Now that we defined monoidal categories, that are nothing but categories together with some additional structure, we have to refine our notion of functor accordingly.

Definition 5. A *monoidal* functor between two monoidal categories $(\mathcal{V}, \otimes_{\mathcal{V}}, I_{\mathcal{V}}) \xrightarrow{F} (\mathcal{W}, \otimes_{\mathcal{W}}, I_{\mathcal{W}})$ is a functor that preserves the monoidal structure in a lax sense (meaning not up to isomorphism). Namely, it comes equipped with morphisms

$$\begin{aligned} F(I_{\mathcal{V}}) &\xrightarrow{\phi_0} I_{\mathcal{W}} \\ FX \otimes_{\mathcal{W}} FY &\xrightarrow{\phi_{X,Y}} F(X \otimes_{\mathcal{V}} Y) \end{aligned}$$

with X, Y ranging over the objects of \mathcal{V} , that express the relation between the image of the tensor and the tensor of the images inside the target category \mathcal{W} ; these adhere to certain axioms [34].

3.3 Natural Transformations

In this work we will also use the fundamental concept of the natural transformation. A natural transformation models the transformation between functors while preserving structure, otherwise called morphism of functors.

Definition 6. Given functors $\mathcal{C} \xrightarrow{F,G} \mathcal{D}$, a *natural transformation* $F \xRightarrow{\eta} G$ consists, for each object A of \mathcal{C} , of a morphism $FA \xrightarrow{\eta_A} GA$ in \mathcal{D} such that, for each morphism $A \xrightarrow{f} B$ in \mathcal{C} ,


$$\eta_B \circ Ff = Gf \circ \eta_A.$$

This is often expressed diagrammatically by saying that the following square has to commute:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} FA & \xrightarrow{\eta_A} & GA \\ Ff \downarrow & & \downarrow Gf \\ FB & \xrightarrow{\eta_B} & GB \end{array}$$

Intuitively, the information contained in a natural transformation $F \xRightarrow{\eta} G$ is enough to guarantee that any commutative diagram made of images of things in \mathcal{C} via F can be turned into a diagram of images of things in \mathcal{C} via G without breaking commutativity. An example is shown in the figure below: The commutativity condition of η means

that it doesn't matter in which order we will "walk through" these arrows, the result will be the same.



3.4 The Yoneda Lemma

The Yoneda Lemma is arguably the most important result in category theory. It follows from a clever observation: consider a functor $\mathcal{C} \xrightarrow{F} \mathbf{Set}$ and an object A of \mathcal{C} . By definition, any natural transformation $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}[A, -] \xRightarrow{\eta} F$ has as components functions between *sets* $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}[A, B] \xrightarrow{\eta_B} FB$. Moreover, for each $A \xrightarrow{f} B$, the following diagram must commute because η is a natural transformation:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}[A, A] & \xrightarrow{\eta_A} & FA \\ \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}[A, f] \downarrow & & \downarrow Ff \\ \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}[A, B] & \xrightarrow{\eta_B} & FB \end{array}$$

In particular, consider $A \xrightarrow{\text{id}_A} A$. This is an element of $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}[A, A]$, and $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}[A, f]$ sends it to f (which is by definition an element of $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}[A, B]$) since it acts by post-composition and $f \circ \text{id}_A = f$. Hence, if η_A sends id_A to, say, $x \in FA$, then η_B will have to send f to $Ff(x)$, otherwise the square will not commute. Since this reasoning can be repeated for any B and any f , it follows that the assignment $\eta_A(\text{id}_A) = x$ *completely determines* η . So we can have as many different η s as there are choices to which we can send id_A . These are as many as the elements in FA , and so we have:

Lemma 7 (Yoneda Lemma). *There is a bijection¹*

$$\text{Nat}[\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}[A, -], F] \simeq FA$$

Where $\text{Nat}[F, G]$ denotes the set of natural transformations between any two functors F, G .

The consequences of Yoneda lemma are far reaching. In particular, the following corollary can be proven:

Corollary 8. *Given objects A, B of \mathcal{C} , if it is²*

$$\text{Nat}[\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}[A, -], F] \simeq \text{Nat}[\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}[B, -], F]$$

1. For readers versed in category theory: $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}[-, -]$ is a contravariant functor in the first component and a covariant functor in the second. It can be proven that the bijection is natural in F and A .

2. For readers versed in category theory: This bijection is required to be natural in F .

for any functor $\mathcal{C} \xrightarrow{F} \mathbf{Set}$, then $A \simeq B$ in \mathcal{C} .

As we already stressed, isomorphic objects in a category behave as if they were the same. Repetitively applying Yoneda lemma one gets that

$$FA \simeq \text{Nat}[\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}[A, -], F] \simeq \text{Nat}[\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}[B, -], F] \simeq FB$$

And hence $A \simeq B$ if and only if $FA \simeq FB$ for any $\mathcal{C} \xrightarrow{F} \mathbf{Set}$. So, with respect to whatever it is that we want to capture by defining a category \mathcal{C} , the Yoneda lemma affirms that we can *completely* characterize an object A by studying its images FA for any functor F to \mathbf{Set} .

We will heavily rely on this to model attacker learning and interpreting functors to \mathbf{Set} as testing procedures (Section 5). Under this view, we summarize Yoneda lemma as:

If two objects agree under any possible test we can perform, then they behave the same.


4 SYSTEMS AS ALGEBRAS

We now use category theory (Section 3) to present a compositional theory of CPS. The general systems-as-algebras paradigm was invented by Schultz et al. [35] and its particular development for CPS was invented by Bakirtzis et al. [11]. This is the cornerstone category to develop a categorical argument for compositional security analysis for CPS models.


Systems as algebras provides a framework to build up to compositional CPS models that can then further enable the compositional study of security properties. In applied category theory diagrams are not mere pictures but instead mathematics in and of themselves [36]. Our choice of categorical structure to represent system models is the category of wiring diagrams and labelled boxes, denoted \mathbf{W} . Therefore, we present the inner workings of the wiring diagram category \mathbf{W} as applied specifically to CPS before moving on to address security property modeling.

Definition 9. We define the *category of wiring diagrams*, \mathbf{W} , as follows:

- The objects of the category \mathbf{W} are pairs of sets $X = (X_{\text{in}}, X_{\text{out}})$, which we depict as labelled boxes:




- The morphisms of the category \mathbf{W} are functions.³ Particularly, a morphism $X \rightarrow Y$ is a pair of morphisms $(f_{\text{in}}: X_{\text{out}} \times Y_{\text{in}} \rightarrow X_{\text{in}}, f_{\text{out}}: X_{\text{out}} \rightarrow Y_{\text{out}})$ in \mathbf{Set} that should be thought of as providing the flow of information in a picture as follows:



3. The functions that we allow have to be made of compositions and cartesian products of identities, diagonals, and projections.

Moreover, the category \mathbf{W} is monoidal and, therefore, comes equipped with a tensor product $X \otimes Y = (X_{\text{in}} \times Y_{\text{in}}, X_{\text{out}} \times Y_{\text{out}})$, that formalizes two processes happening in parallel:



Remark. For the sake of simplicity, we presented the objects of \mathbf{W} as pairs of sets, and morphisms as some kind of functions between them. More generally, the category \mathbf{W} can be defined by requiring objects to be *pairs of categories*, and morphisms to be *functors between them*. This is due to the intrinsic compositionality of category theory, that allows for easy recasting of definitions (in this case, replacing objects and morphisms in \mathbf{Set} with objects and morphisms in \mathbf{Cat}).

\mathbf{W} by itself does not do much, it merely gives a formal composition rule for how labeled boxes and wires are connected. To add some meaning to those boxes we need to develop an algebra that assigns some form of behavior, for example, in the form of automata or state space models.

The semantics of CPS will predominantly exist in the category of sets and functions \mathbf{Set} and, because we are working with control systems, the category of linear spaces and linear maps \mathbf{Lin} .

The boxes at the current moment are uninhabited. Usually we can describe the behavior of a CPS mathematically via some equations. To assign some behavior to the boxes in the wiring diagram category \mathbf{W} , we need to construct an algebra of behaviors F that takes an empty box, say \boxed{Z} , and applies the mathematical interpretation of behavior to it, $F(\boxed{Z})$. Formally, we express this as a functor from \mathbf{W} to \mathbf{Cat} , which assigns to every box a category representing the kind of systems that can inhabit it. Morphisms of \mathbf{W} are mapped to functors that indicate how to build the category of possible inhabitants of the composite system from the system components.

The other way around, one can formally decompose a box (which now is inhabited by mathematical processes) to a particular hardware and software architecture to implement a CPS. In this paper we use an example of a UAV, but the process is repeatable for any well-formed system algebra that can take the following form.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 F: \mathbf{W} & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{Cat} \\
 X = (X_{\text{in}}, X_{\text{out}}) & \longmapsto & FX \\
 f \downarrow & & \downarrow F(f) \\
 Y = (Y_{\text{in}}, Y_{\text{out}}) & \longmapsto & FY
 \end{array}
 \quad
 \begin{array}{l}
 \text{subsystems category} \\
 \text{composite system functor}
 \end{array}$$

5 THE ALGEBRA OF ATTACKER ACTIONS

Now that we have described Yoneda lemma and wiring diagrams and their algebras, we will formalize attacks. This is the core of this work, and all the concepts presented from now on are new developments.

In our effort, we embrace the perspective of the attacker. For us, an attacker is simply an actor wanting to influence or change the behavior of some given system. We do not

distinguish between attacks aiming at taking control of the system (as it is common in computer hacking) and attacks aiming at just influencing its behavior to obtain a particular effect (as in sabotage).

To describe the full cycle of an attack, we split it into two main phases:

- Phase 1) *Learning (exploration)*, or information gathering which is concerned with probing/eavesdropping the system to discern its behavior. We further divide this activity into *general learning*, where the attacker focuses on gathering a general understanding of the system at hand, and *specific learning*, where the attacker probes the system to understand some specific component design choices.
- Phase 2) *Hijacking (exploitation)*, where the attacker, having learned enough information to understand the weak spots of a system, *deploys an exploit* which takes advantage of a found architectural flaw to influence the behavior of the system in some way the attacker desires.

Example 6. Consider an attacker wanting to take control (or to sabotage) an unmanned air vehicle (UAV). The attacker starts by learning; that is, gathering information, about the target UAV (Phase 1). General learning here can be the attacker trying to understand if the UAV has a GPS module on board. In case the answer is positive, specific information gathering consists in understanding how the GPS module communicates with surrounding units.

This general-specific pattern of learning can be arbitrarily repeated: the attacker could now focus on the GPS module itself to understand if some particular kind of integrated circuit is used in its schematic.

Once learning is completed, the exploit can be deployed (Phase 2). In our example, this may be rewriting the firmware of the GPS module *over the air* or, supposing that the attacker has physical access to the UAV, manually rewiring the module or replacing some integrated circuit in it.

One key assumption is that we do not specifically model how a given exploit is developed but only how it is administered, and give a compositional recipe to describe how this change of behavior propagates to the whole system. In practice, this means postulating that the attacker already has access to a knowledge database of tools made to take advantage of a given structural flaw in a given (sub)system. This postulate is not preposterous: indeed, an attacker can hijack a system without personally creating the exploit. This is common in hacking, where *zero day exploits* – that is, exploits of a given flaw that are still unknown to the public, including the target manufacturer – can be commonly bought over the web [24].

Another key assumption of our model is that it can be described as an algebra of wiring diagrams. Again, we do not consider this to be restrictive, for reasons already pointed out by Bakirtzis et al. [11].

5.1 Phase 1 – Learning (Exploration)

First we model general learning. Assuming the perspective of an attacker, we want to model what an attacker does to

understand the kind of system being dealt with. In practice this includes things such as scanning a computer for open ports, firewall and operating system running on it, probing a piece of hardware to obtain information about the integrated circuits being used, etc.

W-algebras – that is, functors $\mathbf{W} \xrightarrow{F} \mathbf{Cat}$ – represent wiring diagrams together with a semantics linking any diagram to the category describing its possible behaviors.

From this it follows that while a particular wiring diagram is just an object X in \mathbf{W} , FX is instead a category: objects are taken to be general behavior assignments for X , while morphisms are taken to be mappings between them that preserve properties we care about. When focusing on a particular system we are not just fixing a wiring diagram X , but also one of the many possible behaviors in the category FX . Hence:

A system is a pair (X, S) , with X an object of \mathbf{W} and S an object of FX .

We suppose we have access to X (this amounts to saying that we are able to distinguish the type of inputs and outputs that our system has) and to FX (we know what type of system we are dealing with), but not to S (we do not know the specific behavior of the system at hand). The first goal of the attacker is to infer S to the degree that an attack is viable.

First things first, we select a subset of the objects of FX , denoted K_{FX} (from “known”), representing the systems that the attacker knows or is familiar with. Notice that K_{FX} should not, in general, lift to a functor $\mathbf{W} \rightarrow \mathbf{Cat}$, since we don’t assume the attacker knowledge to be compositional. For the same reason, given that there will be an injection $K_{FX} \hookrightarrow FX$ representing how the systems known by the attacker embed in the bigger universe of the systems being considered, we do not necessarily assume the attacker to have knowledge of this embedding. Hence,

Definition 10. Given a **W**-algebra $\mathbf{W} \xrightarrow{F} \mathbf{Cat}$ and an object X in \mathbf{W} , a *knowledge database for F, X* is a subset K_{FX} of the objects of FX .

Next, we consider functors $FX \xrightarrow{\Theta} \mathbf{Set}$. These are interpreted as *tests*, or *probes*:

- Given S in FX , ΘS represents the information we get in probing S with a test Θ . For instance, S may represent a machine on a network, while ΘS could represent the output one gets by running `nmap` on S .
- If $S \xrightarrow{f} S'$ is a morphism of FX , then Θf is a way to transform the information in ΘA to information in ΘB . This expresses the fact that our tests are well suited to detect the properties we care about, that are preserved by morphisms of FX .
- In this interpretation functoriality holds on the nose: Transforming a system by “doing nothing” (identity morphism) should give the same test outcome (functor identity law). Moreover, composing transformations should amount to composing outcomes of the testing.

We package all this information as follows:

Definition 11. Given a \mathbf{W} -algebra $\mathbf{W} \xrightarrow{F} \mathbf{Cat}$ and an object X in \mathbf{W} , a *test for F , X* is a functor $FX \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$.

Again, the attacker does not have access to S but has access to ΘS for some tests Θ . This represents the ability of the attacker to perform tests on the system. These tests can be thought of as a persistent reconnaissance mission, which often is the step that takes the longest time and resources of the attacker. The goal of the attacker is to prove in some sense that $S \simeq S'$, for some $S' \in K_{FX}$. This amounts to say that the system S is an instance of a system S' the attacker is familiar with. Given our assumption, we can then postulate that the attacker knows an exploit for S' to move to Phase 2.

We make the assumption that, for any $S' \in K_{FX}$, the attacker has access to S' . This assumption is natural, since S' is by definition in the knowledge base of the attacker. In particular, we assume that the attacker is able to perform *any* test to *any* known system, hence:

For any $S' \in K_{FX}$ and $FX \xrightarrow{\Theta} \mathbf{Set}$,
the attacker has access to $\Theta S'$.

The Yoneda lemma says that if $\Theta S \simeq \Theta S'$ for all Θ , then $S \simeq S'$. Let us try to interpret what this means in our framework, considering some corner cases.

- Suppose that for some object S in FX there is an object S' in K_{FX} such that $S \simeq S'$. If the attacker has access to ΘS for any Θ , then the attacker will be able to conclude $S \simeq S'$ from $\Theta S \simeq \Theta S'$. That is, if the attacker is free to perform any form of testing and possesses a vast knowledge database, then S can be determined with absolute precision.
- If the attacker has access to any Θ , but there is no S' in K_{FX} such that $S \simeq S'$, then the attacker won't be able to conclude $S \simeq S'$: Tests can be arbitrarily precise, but the attacker has no ability to interpret them.
- If there is an object S' in K_{FX} such that $S \simeq S'$, but the attacker has no access to all Θ , then it won't be able to conclude *with certainty* that $S \simeq S'$, because the Yoneda lemma does not hold in this setting. Still, after performing enough tests, the attacker may be prone to *infer* that $S \simeq S'$ if $\Theta S \simeq \Theta S'$ for *enough* Θ ran. This inference comes with a degree of uncertainty, which is exactly what makes information gathering an art more than a science.

That is, the Yoneda lemma provides a formal justification of the fact that testing a system extensively is enough to sufficiently characterize its behavior. We call this heuristic *Yoneda reasoning*.

Some tests are more informative than others. For instance, the “terminal test” Θ sending any X to the singleton set $\{*\}$ is maximally uninformative: the result of this test is the same for any system. On the contrary, a functor that is *injective on objects* lifts to a test that yields the conclusion $X = Y$ from $FX = FY$. Further formalizing the possible spectrum of tests, hopefully weighting them with probability distributions to model their reliability, is an ongoing direction of future work. Now we suppose that the attacker pinned down the target system S with some precision. The

next step of an attack is harvesting information about the architectural design choices implementing the system. That is, after we know how S works, we need to find out what S is made of.

In the last section, we saw that a system is made of an object X in \mathbf{W} together with an object S of FX , for some \mathbf{W} -algebra $F : \mathbf{W} \rightarrow \mathbf{Cat}$.

Now we consider the *category of architectural choices for X* , that is, the slice category \mathbf{W}/X . Objects of this category are morphisms $\bigotimes_i X_i \xrightarrow{\phi} X$, while morphisms are morphisms of wiring diagrams making the following triangle commute.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \bigotimes_i X_i & \xrightarrow{f} & \bigotimes_j X_j \\ & \searrow \phi & \swarrow \psi \\ & X & \end{array}$$

Architectural choices form a category, so we can repeat the reasoning done in the last section using \mathbf{W}/X as the category on which we probe. Again using Yoneda, the attacker is able to ascertain that a given system (X, S) is actually made of subsystems (X_i, S_i) , tensored and wired together by ϕ . Notice that at this stage the attacker still does not know anything about the S_i , so the process must be repeated cyclically.

Summarizing, Phase 1 is modelled as follows:

- 1) The attacker uses tests on FX and Yoneda-reasoning to find the system S representing the semantics of X .
- 2) The attacker uses tests on \mathbf{W}/X and Yoneda-reasoning to find the wiring $\bigotimes_i X_i \xrightarrow{\phi} X$ representing the implementation of X .
- 3) The attacker repeats step 1 on any FX_i of interest to find the precise behavior of the subsystem marked with X_i .
- 4) The attacker repeats step 2 on \mathbf{W}/X_i to obtain more information about the subsystems making up X_i .
- 5) These steps are iterated cyclically until the attacker has gathered enough information to move to exploiting.

In practice, tests will not have to be materially re-run on every FX_i : it is very likely that the attacker has only access to ΘS – every (X_i, S_i) being a subsystem of (X, S) that may not necessarily be exposed to external testing. Nevertheless, it will always be the case that $\Theta(F \bigotimes_i X_i) \xrightarrow{\Theta F \phi} \Theta FX$, meaning that the outputs of tests over every S_i will have to be reconstructed from tests over S . This adds another layer of uncertainty for the attacker, who has to devise tests for which the mapping $\Theta F \phi$ acts as transparently as possible. Again, this backs up intuition: going back to Example 6, if some system (X, S) comprises a subsystem (X_i, S_i) (say, a GPS module), then we could devise a test on FX such that in ΘS the behavior of the subsystem S_i is made apparent. Similarly, when running `nmap` on a system we can get extra information about which services are running behind which port, for example, `nginx` behind port 80. By probing the system as a whole, the attacker is getting information about its subsystems.




Fig. 1. The hierarchical decomposition from behavior to candidate system architecture is formally contained within the slice category \mathbf{C}/c in which there exist all possible design decisions that adhere to the behavioral model as defined in the abstraction above the system architecture. We segment here to subsystems following a behavior decomposition to sensors L , controller C , and dynamics D . Split wires indicate function duplication, Δ .

5.2 Phase 2 – Hijacking (Exploitation)

Now suppose that the attacker has a good grasp of the system behavior and architecture, and model the last step, in which the system is hijacked and exploited.

We distinguish between two main kinds of attacks:

- Type 1) *Rewriting attacks*, where the behavior of a (sub)system is changed. Practical examples of this are, for instance, exploiting a vulnerability in a WiFi card to rewrite its firmware, and using this change of behavior to progress towards obtaining administrative privileges over the whole machine;
- Type 2) *Rewiring attacks*, that are concerned with modifying the way subsystems communicate with each other.

Definition 12. Given a \mathbf{W} -algebra F , a *rewriting attack* for F is a monoidal natural transformation

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{W} & \xrightarrow{F} & \mathbf{Cat} \\ & \searrow F & \downarrow \eta \\ & & \mathbf{Cat} \end{array}$$

Notice how in a rewriting attack we do not change the possible behaviors that are assigned to wiring diagrams, but we reshuffle them. If (X, S) was our system, then S is an object of FX , which is in turn an object of \mathbf{Cat} . We then see that η_X is a morphism $FX \rightarrow FX$ in \mathbf{Cat} , that is, a functor $FX \rightarrow FX$. Applying it to S we get that the behavior of our new system is $\eta_X S$.

The fact that η is natural monoidal yields a compositional description of an attack: in modifying the behavior of a given subsystem, we can infer how the behavior of the whole system changes.

Definition 13. Given a \mathbf{W} -algebra F , a *rewiring attack* for F

is a functor

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{W} & & \\ \downarrow h & \searrow & \\ \mathbf{W} & \xrightarrow{F} & \mathbf{Cat} \end{array}$$

Here h represents a reshuffling of the wirings and boxes. The new behavior can then be obtained by considering the composition $F \circ h$. If we started with system (X, S) , now the behavior of the hijacked system is $(hX, (F \circ h)X)$. Again, the nature of this attack is compositional: It describes how altering systematically a wiring in \mathbf{W} resonates through all the systems modelled by F .

We conclude by noticing that both rewriting and rewiring attacks form categories. This conforms with our intuition that attacks can be performed in batches, or stacked one on top of each other.

6 DEMONSTRATION

We demonstrate the use of the Yoneda lemma as a possible model for security tests and exploitation method over a system model of a UAV from the perspective of attacker actions (Example 6).

The UAV is composed of a sensor unit – denoted L , in red; of a controller unit – denoted C , in blue; and of a dynamics unit – denoted D , in brown (Fig. 1). Each of this unit is itself composed of various subsystems. There are multiple possible system architectures that can implement this higher level behavior. We assume that the attacker is familiar with the general class of vehicle CPS. For illustrative purposes we focus on one possible but relatively simple system architecture.

Let's start with the minimum observability possible – for the attacker the UAV is just a black box with three inputs and one output, which we denote UAV. The first step of the attack is gathering information about its behavior.

Our systems-as-algebras model (Section 4) represents the assignment of behaviors to wiring diagrams with a functor

$$F : \mathbf{W} \rightarrow \mathbf{Cat}.$$

In our running example, $F(\text{UAV})$ denotes the category of all the possible behaviors that we can assign to the UAV box. Thus, our UAV is a pair (UAV, S) with S an object of $F(\text{UAV})$ representing the particular UAV model at hand.

In general information gathering, the attacker uses Yoneda reasoning to infer S . To do so, the attacker must be able to perform a set of tests on the system S . Any of such tests is a functor

$$\Theta : F(\text{UAV}) \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$$

and the result of the test Θ applied to S is denoted ΘS (in category theory practice, it is customary to avoid parentheses whenever possible). In our particular case, Θ may be a test that analyzes the aerodynamics of the UAV during flight. The more informative Θ is, and the bigger the number




Fig. 2. The attacker's understanding of the system after the first cycle of learning.

of Θ 's the attacker can have access to, the more it will be likely to infer S . If the attacker finds that $S \simeq S'$ for some S' in their knowledge database, $K_{F(\text{UAV})}$, then the attacker will know how the UAV behaves.

In practice, it is very unlikely for the attacker to have access to *every* test Θ . As we mention above (Section 5), this entails that the attacker won't be able to infer with certainty that $S \simeq S'$: most likely, the attacker will be *prone to infer* $S \simeq S'$ with a certain degree of confidence. As such, the outcome of testing is probabilistic more than deterministic. Assuming that the attacker inferred $S \simeq S'$ for




Fig. 3. The architecture of the sensory system as understood by the attacker, which is in reality erroneous but behaviorally equivalent. The attacker found that there is one IMU (when in reality there are two) and a GPS.

some system S' in their knowledge database, the particular design choices making up the UAV are still unknown to

them. Applying Yoneda reasoning again to the category \mathbf{W}/UAV , they may be able to infer some of these design choices. For instance, it could be possible to infer an initial understanding of what the UAV is composed of (Fig. 2).




Fig. 4. The compromised UAV, with GPS firmware hacked and input wires to the IMU units swapped.

The attacker sees the system as decomposed into boxes L' , C' and D' , which will be behaviorally equivalent to L , C and D , respectively. The inner workings of such boxes are still unknown to the attacker, that now focuses on L' . This amounts to repeat the same cycle of Yoneda reasoning focusing on tests that target L in particular (Section 5). After running these test, the attacker sees a first approximation of the UAV (Fig. 3).

The initial understanding of the attacker is slightly erroneous, since the two separated IMU units in UAV have been conflated into one. Still, the two wiring diagrams are behaviorally equivalent. This both reflects the fact that on one hand Yoneda reasoning is probabilistic in nature, and on the other that identification of system happens only up to behavioral equivalence.

Now, suppose the attacker decides to do two things: rewriting the firmware of the GPS module G , and cutting its feedback input. The first is a rewriting attack and the second is a rewiring attack (Section 5).

The rewriting attack is represented by a monoidal natural transformation $\eta : F \rightarrow F$. This means that for each box X , η_X is a functor $FX \xrightarrow{\eta_X} FX$. The components on the wiring diagrams I' , P' , C' and D' are just the identity functors. This means that these boxes are mapped to themselves unchanged. On G' , the functor $\eta_{G'} : FG' \rightarrow FG'$ is instead different from the identity. If g is the object of FG' representing the particular GPS unit used in the system (UAV, S) , then $\eta_{G'}g$ represents the GPS module with its firmware rewritten. The behavior of η on the composite boxes L' , C' , D' and their composition can be inferred from the fact that η is a natural transformation, and hence the naturality squares have to commute.

The rewiring attack, instead, is an endofunctor $\mathbf{W} \rightarrow \mathbf{W}$, which we set to be identity on objects. On morphisms, it remaps the wiring of G' inside the box L' (Fig. 3) such that there is no wire coming from the outside (Fig. 4). In sequence, we can represent the effect of both attacks as changes in boxes and wires within UAV, as perceived by the attacker. The resulting wiring diagram is completely determined from the initial attacker learning wiring diagram (Fig. 3) by the fact that behavior assignment is functorial; compositionally allows us to infer the behavior of the com-




Fig. 5. The UAV (Fig. 1), after the attack.

posite after having replaced G' and having swapped the wirings of the IMU units.

The resulting wiring diagram (Fig. 4) represents how the attacker presumes the system will behave after the exploit is deployed, assuming the system was correctly profiled in Phase 1. Since Phase 1 has margin for error, the attacker can re-probe the system to assure that the perceived behavior is compatible with reality. This further round of testing is necessary to assert with confidence that the exploit has been deployed correctly.

In this example, we postulated that the attacker was indeed able to correctly gather information about the UAV. Formally, we expressed this by stating that what we consider to be the actual UAV (Fig. 1) and the attacker's understanding of what the UAV is (Fig. 3) are behaviorally equivalent. Because functors preserve isomorphisms, we are able to describe how the attack impacts the real UAV (Fig. 5).

We now describe several other possible attacks: one consists in feeding a counterfeit GPS signal to the UAV to compromise it. This sort of attack is documented “CAPEC-627: Counterfeit GPS Signals” and is considered difficult to realize. The wiring diagrams formalism gives us an idea of why: feeding a counterfeit GPS signal does not involve modifying the GPS module in any way. What changes is the information travelling on the GPS wires which communicates with the outside world. So, to understand this

attack properly, one needs to model how the UAV interacts with the environment it is in (Fig. 6). Here, by Environment we mean a process that given the UAV position in space and time returns the data sensed by the IMU and GPS units. In this sense, we see that spoofing a GPS signal does not amount to intervening on the UAV, but on the environment itself. Attackers rarely have the capacity to control the environment within a region of space and time – radio waves from the GPS satellites in this particular case – that is big enough to influence the behavior of the single UAV.




Fig. 7. Social engineering attacks may hijack the ground control station (GCS).




Fig. 6. Feeding counterfeit GPS signals to the UAV hijacks Environment.

To conclude, we present another possible attack, performed by means of *social engineering*. As with the previous example, social engineering does not exploit the UAV itself, but instead takes advantage of the human factor surrounding it. Examples of this may include bribing whoever programs the UAV goals, or making the control tower believe that a given order has been officially issued from whoever is in command, for example, as defined in “CAPEC-137: Parameter Injection”.

As in the previous case, the behavior of the UAV as a wiring diagram is unchanged. Instead, what changes is the information travelling on the first input wire of the UAV box. From our perspective, this requires again to put the UAV into context (Fig. 7). An attack based on social engineering will consist in rewriting the box GCS, which abstracts away a possible ground control station.

The categorical semantics of CPS security modeling for the UAV can be implemented algorithmically (Listing 1 & 2).

Listing 1
Modeling attacker learning

```
-- Define category of wiring diagrams
W : Category
W = Definition 9

-- Define functor for UAV modeling
F : Functor W → Cat
F = assignment of UAV behavior (linear time invariant
    system) to boxes

-- Model UAV as a 2-input 1-output W-box
UAV : W
UAV = (2,1)

-- Knowledge database
KF(UAV) : List F(UAV)
KF(UAV) = attacker knowledge for systems of type UAV

-- Compare tests with target S
CompareTests : (Functor F(UAV) → Set) → F(UAV) → Bool
CompareTests Θ S' = Θ(KF(UAV)(S')) ≈ Θ(S)

-- Yoneda reasoning
for each Θ : Functor F(UAV) → Set
    filter (CompareTests Θ) K

-- Running security tests reveals the following boxes
L', C', D' : W
L', C' = (2,1)
D' = (1,1)

diagram : Morphism W (L' ⊗ C' ⊗ D') → UAV
diagram = (in, out)
where
    in : Morphism Set
        UAVin × (L'out × C'out × D'out) → (L'in × C'in × D'in)
    in u1 u2 l c d = (u2, d, u1, c)
    out : Morphism Set (L'out × C'out × D'out) → UAVout
    out l c d = d
```

Listing 2
Modeling hijacking

```
-- By iterating learning further decompose L'
I', G', P' : W
I', G', P' = (2,1)

Ldiagram : Morphism W (I' ⊗ G' ⊗ P') → L'
Ldiagram = (in, out)
where
    in : Morphism Set
        (L'in × (I'out × G'out × P'out) → (I'in × G'in × P'in))
    in l1 l2 i g p = (l1, l2, l1, l2, i, g)
    out : Morphism Set (I'out × G'out × P'out) → L'out
    out i g p = p

-- Rewriting attack
η : NatTrans (Functor W → Cat) → (Functor W → Cat)

-- η is the identity on everything but G'
η G' : Morphism F G' → F G'
η G' = firmware rewriting

-- Rewiring attack
Lattack : Morphism W (I' ⊗ G' ⊗ P') → L'
Lattack = (in, out)
where
    in : Morphism Set
        (L'in × (I'out × G'out × P'out) → (I'in × G'in × P'in))
    in l1 l2 i g p = (l1, l2, l1, 0, i, g)
    out : Morphism Set (I'out × G'out × P'out) → L'out
```

out i g p = p

Rewiring : Functor W → W
Rewiring Ldiagram = Lattack

```
-- The modified behavior of the hijacked UAV
behavior : F(UAV)
behavior = η UAV (F(Rewiring (UAV))) (S')
```

LIMITATIONS Based on how we defined Yoneda reasoning, we identify several limitations. These limitations can be overcome by enriching over metric spaces, which we will also discuss. The main point of this paper is setting a strong theoretical footprint of category theory and the diagrammatic reasoning that emerges in the application of securing CPS. Making the results probabilistically concrete is a potential future topic that can be based on the above formal methods.

One such limitation can be inspected from the resulting algorithm (Listing 1). As output we may have that Yoneda reasoning returns no result (the list being filtered from K is empty, meaning that the attacker does not have entries in the knowledge database that adequately model the target system), but we may also have that it returns more than one (the list being filtered from K having more than one element, meaning that the test performed were not fine-grained enough to pinpoint the target system with deterministic accuracy). This is mainly due to the nature of the tests performed. Indeed, some tests could be more informative than others; sending any system in $F(UAV)$ to the one-element set defines a functor to **Set** and hence a valid test, which is though maximally uninformative since the test outcome will be the same on all systems; on the other hand, any injective-on-objects functor Θ allows us to conclude with certainty that $\Theta S = \Theta S'$ implies $S = S'$, and is hence maximally granular. The formalism as we presented it has no way to express which subset of the tests we can perform allows to individuate the target system unambiguously.

Indeed, there are tests with different degrees of expressiveness, and the Yoneda lemma does not account for this; we are able to conclude $S \simeq S'$ using Yoneda lemma if and only if S and S' agree on *all* tests, including the maximally useless ones. This is why we speak of Yoneda reasoning as a heuristic and not as a deterministic procedure.

Looking at things more abstractly, the ultimate reason for this shortcoming lies in the fact that in our definition of category we considered homsets to be sets; that is, we speak of the *set* $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}[A, B]$ of all possible morphisms from A to B in some category \mathcal{C} . Sets have very little structure, and in such an environment we cannot formulate the Yoneda lemma to be more expressive.

In a probabilistic setting, what we would like to have is a version of Yoneda reasoning that gives an *interval of confidence* relating $\Theta S \simeq \Theta S'$ and $S \simeq S'$ for any possible test Θ . In other words, we want to attach to each Θ a measure of how informative Θ is in our context.

This is certainly doable by resorting to *enriched category theory*, which is a generalization of category theory where homsets can have more structure. In particular, we can reformulate our theory using categories enriched over metric spaces. This gives a natural way of talking about

distances between sets and this can be used to ultimately define a measure on the tests we can perform. In the context of enriched category theory, the Yoneda lemma can be reformulated in what it is informally known as *ninja Yoneda lemma* [37], which takes into account this additional structure. We can use this to define a version of Yoneda lemma that has a notion of confidence in the tests we perform over the CPS model and, therefore, have some granularity of what it means for two systems to be behaviorally equivalent under *some* (informative) tests.

BENEFITS While we showed some limitations with regard to the flexibility of the model, it is important to point out that the same flexibility can be beneficial. Different formalisms can inhabit the boxes defining a systems behavior, from Petri nets, to transition systems, to ordinary differential equations. The development of our formalisms will allow us to speak about all these representations within one framework. For example, applications to security modeling using Petri nets [38] is currently congruent with research in category theory and Petri nets [39], [40], [41], [42] and could be leveraged to make the application of the preceding formalism more concrete as a model of (mis-)behavior. Similarly, both models of security violations in automata [43] and continuous controller behavior [44] can be represented within our framework and, therefore, allow for a plethora of analyses within one model.

However, in order to drill further in the possible directions of describing different types of continuous, for example false sensor data, or discrete, for example transitioning the system to a hazardous state, misbehaviors caused by exploitation we require a first formulation of security modeling categorically and algebraically. This paper serves this purpose. Relaxing some of the unrealistic assumptions we made is then a matter of incorporating developing work from category theory.

Additionally, this security framework is part of an alternate paradigm of systems modeling that has its foundations in categorical modeling. In this framework it is possible to provide formal traces requirements, behaviors, and architectures [18] but also describe a vast amount of dynamical systems with applications to robotics, event-based systems, and hybrid systems, to name a few [45], [46], [47], [48].

Finally, this paper addresses the theoretical underpinnings of security modeling in category theory. But, the recent surge of categorical modeling languages and software, such as Catlab [49] or idris-ct [50] or algebraic databases [15], can be used to create modeling tools and security assessment methods based on the work presented in this paper practical within compositional CPS theory.

7 RELATED WORK

In general, category theory is effective in describing hybrid systems [48], [51], [52] and more recently there has been successful work in modeling and analysis of CPS using category theory [11], [53], [54], [55]. An important motivation for developing a categorical *modeling* security framework is the theory of co-design, a way of dealing with abstraction and refinement in models, which has recently been applied categorically to robotics [56] and control system design [57].

To the best of our knowledge, there is little work at the intersection of category theory, CPS, and security *modeling*. One such work is using the categorical interpretation of databases to share threat information, but it does not propose how this paradigm improves upon graph methods for security [58]. There is also a line of work that uses category theory to study cryptographic functions as illustrated, for example, by Pavlovic [59]. The modeling approach presented in this paper does not develop security techniques for defenses but instead focuses on the dual of the research questions answered by cryptography. While cryptography asks how can we communicate securely, systems modeling and analysis asks how can we represent attacker actions over a behavioral and architectural model in a manner that is traceable, such that we can examine what mitigation strategies to implement in the design of the system. The same differentiation applies to secure design using dependent types [60] – which are often formalized categorically – and categorical data flow analysis [61].

On the side of attacker modeling for CPS, there is a vast area of research using graph formalisms. Examples include attack graphs [12] and attack profiles using graph models as shown recently by Weber et al. [62], including particular applications to industrial control systems [63]. Our wiring diagram model can be thought of as a graph with extra structure, namely the added structure of the category, and therefore such methods could also be incorporated to our algebraic security tests paradigm.

From the controls or system behavior view, defenders are able to intercept the *learning* phase of attacker actions by adding a privacy-enhancing signal into the controller [64]. From purely modeling, which is more closely related to techniques from reliability and dependability, recent work aims to merge attack trees with standard design practices for embedded systems [65]. Both these frameworks are relevant to one abstraction level, that of system behavior, and could be subsumed by the categorical formalism we present above. In the future, both the controls and modeling approaches could be improved within our framework by providing formal composition and traceability between the expected behavior and the eventual synthesized design.

All in all, we perceive applications of category theory to model-based security as relatively unfledged and hope to see category theory used as effectively in security modeling as it has for programming languages [50], [66], [67], [68] and cryptography [69], [70].

8 CONCLUSION

We develop a categorical semantics for CPS security modeling that is able to determine that two system representations are behaviorally equivalent provided that they agree on every test. The implication of this statement is that it is possible to model attacker actions without necessarily needing to give the attacker full observability on the system under attack. Additionally, we model two types of attacks on the incomplete but erroneous view of the attacker and show its impact on (what we consider to be) the real system. These attacks can do either of two things: (1) rewriting some system component or (2) rewiring an input or output from or to a component. This model is particularly useful for CPS,

where in the future we would like to say how a particular attack can change system behavior and, therefore, potentially transition it to a hazardous state. Overall, we model how the attacker *learns* about a system and how an attacker then might attempt to *hijack* the system from the knowledge that they were able to gather in a formal, unified way. Finally, the categorical formalism can be considered foundational, in the sense that in addition to the contributions above it can subsume already developed formalisms for modeling attacker actions, for example attack graphs, or augment the information contained in the model by using security frameworks.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors thank D. Evans and C. Vasilakopoulou for constructive discussions and feedback.

REFERENCES

- [1] C. E. Landwehr, "Cybersecurity: From engineering to science," *Next Wave*, 2012.
- [2] D. Pavlovic, "Towards a science of trust," in *Proceedings of the 2015 Symposium and Bootcamp on the Science of Security (HotSoS 2015)*. ACM, 2015. doi: 10.1145/2746194.2746197
- [3] D. Evans, "NSF/IARPA/NSA workshop on the science of security," <https://web.archive.org/web/20200705152357/https://sos.cs.virginia.edu/>, 2008.
- [4] D. M. Nicol, W. H. Sanders, and K. S. Trivedi, "Model-based evaluation: from dependability to security," *IEEE Transactions on Dependable and Secure Computing*, 2004. doi: 10.1109/TDSC.2004.11
- [5] A. Avizienis, J. Laprie, B. Randell, and C. E. Landwehr, "Basic concepts and taxonomy of dependable and secure computing," *IEEE Transactions on Dependable and Secure Computing*, 2004. doi: 10.1109/TDSC.2004.2
- [6] G. Bakirtzis, G. L. Ward, C. J. Deloglos, C. R. Elks, B. M. Horowitz, and C. H. Fleming, "Fundamental challenges of cyber-physical systems security modeling," in *Proceedings of the 50th IFIP/IEEE International Conference on Dependable Systems and Networks (DSN)*. IEEE, 2020. doi: 10.1109/DSN-S50200.2020.00021
- [7] J. Lambert, "Defenders think in lists. Attackers think in graphs. As long as this is true, attackers win." <https://perma.cc/6NZ2-A2HY>, 2015.
- [8] G. Bakirtzis, B. J. Simon, A. G. Collins, C. H. Fleming, and C. R. Elks, "Data-driven vulnerability exploration for design phase system analysis," *IEEE Systems Journal*, 2019. doi: 10.1109/JSYST.2019.2940145
- [9] A. Datta, J. Franklin, D. Garg, L. Jia, and D. K. Kaynar, "On adversary models and compositional security," *IEEE Security & Privacy*, 2011. doi: 10.1109/MSP.2010.203
- [10] A. Strafacci, "What does BIM mean for civil engineers," *CE News, Transportation*, 2008.
- [11] G. Bakirtzis, C. Vasilakopoulou, and C. H. Fleming, "Compositional cyber-physical systems modeling," in *Proceedings of the 2019 Applied Category Theory Conference (ACT 2020)*, ser. Electronic Proceedings in Theoretical Computer Science. Open Publishing Association, 2020.
- [12] O. Sheyner, J. Haines, S. Jha, R. Lippmann, and J. M. Wing, "Automated generation and analysis of attack graphs," in *Proceedings 2002 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy*. IEEE, 2002. doi: 10.1109/SECPR.2002.1004377
- [13] S. Abramsky and B. Coecke, "Categorical quantum mechanics," in *Handbook of Quantum Logic and Quantum Structures*. Elsevier, 2009.
- [14] B. Coecke, "Quantum pictorialism," *Contemporary physics*, 2010. doi: 10.1080/00107510903257624
- [15] P. Schultz, D. I. Spivak, C. Vasilakopoulou, and R. Wisnesky, "Algebraic databases," *Theory & Applications of Categories*, 2016.
- [16] "MITRE common attack pattern enumeration and classification (CAPEC)," URL <https://capec.mitre.org/>, 2020.
- [17] B. E. Strom, A. Applebaum, D. P. Miller, K. C. Nickels, A. G. Pennington, and C. B. Thomas, "MITRE ATT&CK: Design and philosophy," MITRE, Tech. Rep. MP180360, 2018.
- [18] G. Bakirtzis, C. H. Fleming, and C. Vasilakopoulou, "Categorical semantics of cyber-physical systems theory," 2020, arXiv:2010.08003 [cs.LO].
- [19] E. A. Lee, "Cyber-physical systems – Are computing foundations adequate," Position paper for NSF workshop on cyber-physical systems: Research motivation, techniques and roadmap, 2006.
- [20] A. A. Cárdenas, S. Amin, and S. Sastry, "Research challenges for the security of control systems," in *Proceedings of the 3rd USENIX Workshop on Hot Topics in Security (HotSec 2008)*, N. Provos, Ed. USENIX Association, 2008. [Online]. Available: http://www.usenix.org/events/hotsec08/tech/full_papers/cardenas/cardenas.pdf
- [21] J. Giraldo, E. Sarkar, A. A. Cárdenas, M. Maniatakis, and M. Kantarcioglu, "Security and privacy in cyber-physical systems: A survey of surveys," *IEEE Design & Test*, 2017. doi: 10.1109/M-DAT.2017.2709310
- [22] C. Herley and P. C. van Oorschot, "SoK: Science, security and the elusive goal of security as a scientific pursuit," in *Proceedings of the 2017 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (S&P)*. IEEE Computer Society, 2017. doi: 10.1109/SP.2017.38
- [23] M. Lipp, M. Schwarz, D. Gruss, T. Prescher, W. Haas, J. Horn, S. Mangard, P. Kocher, D. Genkin, Y. Yarom, M. Hamburg, and R. Strackx, "Meltdown: reading kernel memory from user space," *Communications of the ACM*, 2020. doi: 10.1145/3357033
- [24] L. Ablon, M. C. Libicki, and A. A. Golay, "Markets for cybercrime tools and stolen data: Hackers' bazaar," Rand Corporation, Tech. Rep. RR-610-JNI, 2014. [Online]. Available: https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR610.html
- [25] D. Maynor, "OS X kernel-mode exploitation in a weekend," Errata Security, Tech. Rep., 2007.
- [26] G. Boisseau and J. Gibbons, "What you needa know about Yoneda: Profunctor optics and the Yoneda lemma (functional pearl)," *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages*, 2018. doi: 10.1145/3236779
- [27] M. Stay and J. Vicary, "Bicategorical semantics for nondeterministic computation," in *Proceedings of the 20th Conference on the Mathematical Foundations of Programming Semantics (MFPS 2013)*, ser. Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science. Elsevier, 2013. doi: 10.1016/j.entcs.2013.09.022
- [28] P. Hines, "A diagrammatic approach to information flow in encrypted communication," arXiv 2008.05840, 2020.
- [29] F. W. Lawvere and S. H. Schanuel, *Conceptual mathematics: a first introduction to categories*. Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- [30] T. Leinster, *Basic Category Theory*. Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- [31] D. Long, "MBSE: Simple, complicated, or complex?" <https://web.archive.org/web/20200409185640/http://community.vitechcorp.com/index.php/mbse-simple-complicated-or-complex.aspx>, 2020.
- [32] D. I. Spivak and J. Tan, "Nesting of dynamical systems and mode-dependent networks," *Journal of Complex Networks*, 2017. doi: 10.1093/comnet/cnw022
- [33] Z. Diskin, T. Maibaum, and K. Czarnecki, "A model management imperative: Being graphical is not sufficient, you have to be categorical," in *Proceedings of the 11th European Conference on Modelling Foundations and Applications (ECMFA)*, 2015. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-21151-0_11
- [34] A. Joyal and R. Street, "Braided tensor categories," *Advances in Mathematics*, 1993. doi: 10.1006/aima.1993.1055
- [35] P. Schultz, D. I. Spivak, and C. Vasilakopoulou, "Dynamical systems and sheaves," *Applied Categorical Structures*, 2019. doi: DOI:10.1007/s10485-019-09565
- [36] B. Coecke and É. Paquette, "Categories for the practising physicist," in *New Structures for Physics*. Springer, 2011. doi: 10.1007/978-3-642-12821-9_3
- [37] F. Løregian, "Coend calculus," arXiv 1501.02503, 2019.
- [38] V. Lesi, Z. Jakovljevic, and M. Pajic, "Security analysis for distributed IoT-based industrial automation," 2020, arXiv:2006.00044.
- [39] J. C. Baez and J. Master, "Open Petri nets," *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science*, 2020. doi: 10.1017/S0960129520000043
- [40] F. Genovese and J. Herold, "Executions in (semi-)integer Petri nets are compact closed categories," *Electronic Proceedings in Theoretical Computer Science*, 2019. doi: 10.4204/EPTCS.287.7
- [41] F. Genovese, A. Gryzlov, J. Herold, M. Perone, E. Post, and A. Videla, "Computational Petri nets: Adjunctions considered harmful," arXiv 1904.12974, 2019.
- [42] Statebox Team, "The mathematical specification of the statebox language," arXiv 1906.07629, 2019.

- [43] Y. Wang and M. Pajic, "Supervisory control of discrete event systems in the presence of sensor and actuator attacks," in *2019 IEEE 58th Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*. IEEE, 2019. doi: 10.1109/CDC40024.2019.9029767
- [44] M. Pajic, J. Weimer, N. Bezzo, P. Tabuada, O. Sokolsky, and G. J. Pappas, "Robustness of attack-resilient state estimators," in *ACM/IEEE International Conference on Cyber-Physical Systems (ICCCPS)*. IEEE Computer Society, 2014. doi: 10.1109/IC-CPS.2014.6843720
- [45] S. Libkind, "An algebra of resource sharing machines," 2020, arXiv:2007.14442 [math.CT].
- [46] B. Fong, A. Speranzon, and D. I. Spivak, "Temporal landscapes: A graphical temporal logic for reasoning," 2019, arXiv:1904.01081 [math.LO].
- [47] G. Zardini, D. I. Spivak, A. Censi, and E. Frazzoli, "A compositional sheaf-theoretic framework for event-based systems," in *Proceedings of the 2019 Applied Category Theory Conference (ACT 2020)*, ser. Electronic Proceedings in Theoretical Computer Science. Open Publishing Association, 2020.
- [48] J. Culbertson, P. Gustafson, D. E. Koditschek, and P. F. Stiller, "Formal composition of hybrid systems," 2020, arXiv:1911.01267 [math.CT].
- [49] M. Halter, E. Patterson, A. Baas, and J. Fairbanks, "Compositional scientific computing with catlab and semantic models," 2020, arXiv:2005.04831 [math.CT].
- [50] F. Genovese, A. Gryzlov, J. Herold, A. Knispel, M. Perone, E. Post, and A. Videla, "idris-ct: A library to do category theory in idris," in *Proceedings of the 2019 Applied Category Theory Conference (ACT 2019)*, ser. Electronic Proceedings in Theoretical Computer Science. Open Publishing Association, 2020. doi: 10.4204/EPTCS.323.16
- [51] P. Tabuada, G. J. Pappas, and P. U. Lima, "Composing abstractions of hybrid systems," in *Proceedings of the 5th International Workshop on Hybrid Systems: Computation and Control (HSCC 2002)*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science. Springer, 2002. doi: 10.1007/3-540-45873-5_34
- [52] A. D. Ames, "A categorical theory of hybrid systems," Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 2006.
- [53] J. S. Nolan, B. S. Pollard, S. Breiner, D. Anand, and E. Subrahmanian, "Compositional models for power systems," in *Proceedings of the 2019 Applied Category Theory Conference (ACT 2019)*, ser. Electronic Proceedings in Theoretical Computer Science. Open Publishing Association, 2020. doi: 10.4204/EPTCS.323.10
- [54] S. Breiner, R. D. Sriram, and E. Subrahmanian, "Compositional models for complex systems," in *Artificial Intelligence for the Internet of Everything*. Elsevier, 2019. doi: 10.1016/B978-0-12-817636-8.00013-2
- [55] S. Breiner, O. Marie-Rose, B. S. Pollard, and E. Subrahmanian, "Operadic diagnosis in hierarchical systems," in *Proceedings of the 2019 Applied Category Theory Conference (ACT 2019)*, ser. Electronic Proceedings in Theoretical Computer Science. Open Publishing Association, 2020. doi: 10.4204/EPTCS.323.5
- [56] G. Zardini, D. Milojevic, A. Censi, and E. Frazzoli, "A formal approach to the co-design of embodied intelligence," 2020, arXiv:2011.10756 [cs.RO].
- [57] G. Zardini, A. Censi, and E. Frazzoli, "Co-design of autonomous systems: From hardware selection to control synthesis," 2020, arXiv:2011.10758 [eess.SY].
- [58] J. Andrian, C. Kamhoua, K. Kiat, and L. Njilla, "Cyber threat information sharing: A category-theoretic approach," in *Proceedings of the 2017 Third International Conference on Mobile and Secure Services (MobiSecServ)*. IEEE, 2017. doi: 10.1109/MOBISERV.2017.7886562 pp. 1–5.
- [59] D. Pavlovic, *Chasing Diagrams in Cryptography*. Springer, 2014.
- [60] M. Hennessy, "The security pi-calculus and non-interference," *The Journal of Logic and Algebraic Programming*, 2005. doi: 10.1016/j.jlap.2004.01.003
- [61] M. Zhu, P. Grogono, O. Ormandjieva, and P. Kamthan, "Using category theory and data flow analysis for modeling and verifying properties of communications in the process-oriented language erasmus," in *International C* Conference on Computer Science & Software Engineering (C3S2E 2014)*. ACM, 2014. doi: 10.1145/2641483.2641529
- [62] M. Weber, B. Jin, G. Lederman, Y. Shoukry, E. A. Lee, S. Seshia, and A. Sangiovanni-Vincentelli, "Gordian: Formal reasoning-based outlier detection for secure localization," *ACM Transactions on Cyber-Physical Systems*, 2020. doi: 10.1145/3386568
- [63] A. T. Al Ghazo, M. Ibrahim, H. Ren, and R. Kumar, "A2G2V: Automatic attack graph generation and visualization and its applications to computer and scada networks," *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics: Systems*, 2019. doi: 10.1109/TSMC.2019.2915940
- [64] M. J. Khojasteh, A. Khina, M. Franceschetti, and T. Javidi, "Learning-based attacks in cyber-physical systems," *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems*, 2020. doi: 10.1109/TCNS.2020.3028035
- [65] L. W. Li, F. Lugou, and L. Apvrille, "Evolving attacker perspectives for secure embedded system design," in *Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Model-Driven Engineering and Software Development (MODELSWARD 2018)*. SciTePress, 2018. doi: 10.5220/0006535802870294
- [66] B. C. Pierce, C. Benjamin, B. C. Pierce, M. R. Garey, and A. Meyer, *Basic category theory for computer scientists*. MIT press, 1991.
- [67] M. Stay and J. Vicary, "Bicategorical semantics for nondeterministic computation," in *Proceedings of the 29th Conference on the Mathematical Foundations of Programming Semantics (MFPS 2013)*, ser. Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science. Elsevier, 2013. doi: 10.1016/j.entcs.2013.09.022
- [68] D. Gratzer, G. A. Kavvos, A. Nuyts, and L. Birkedal, "Multimodal dependent type theory," in *Proceedings of 35th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS '20)*. ACM, 2020. doi: 10.1145/3373718.3394736
- [69] A. Datta, A. Derek, J. C. Mitchell, and D. Pavlovic, "A derivation system and compositional logic for security protocols," *Journal of Computer Security*, 2005. doi: 10.3233/JCS-2005-13304
- [70] F. Genovese, A. Knispel, and J. Fitzgerald, "Mapping finite state machines to ZK-SNARKs using category theory," arXiv 1909.02893, 2019.