Expressive Power

• How do the sets of systems that models can describe compare?
  – If HRU equivalent to SPM, SPM provides more specific answer to safety question
  – If HRU describes more systems, SPM applies only to the systems it can describe

HRU vs. SPM

• SPM more abstract
  – Analyses focus on limits of model, not details of representation
• HRU allows revocation
  – SMP has no equivalent to delete, destroy
• HRU allows multiparent creates
  – SPM cannot express multiparent creates easily, and not at all if the parents are of different types because can create allows for only one type of creator
Multiparent Create

• Solves mutual suspicion problem
  – Create proxy jointly, each gives it needed rights

• In HRU:
  \[
  \text{command } \text{multicreate}(s_0, s_1, o) \\
  \text{if } r \text{ in } a[s_0, s_1] \text{ and } r \text{ in } a[s_1, s_0] \\
  \text{then} \\
  \text{create object } o; \\
  \text{enter } r \text{ into } a[s_0, o]; \\
  \text{enter } r \text{ into } a[s_1, o]; \\
  \text{end}
  \]

SPM and Multiparent Create

• can create extended in obvious way
  – \( cc \subseteq TS \times \ldots \times TS \times T \)

• Symbols
  – \( X_1, \ldots, X_n \) parents, \( Y \) created
  – \( R_{1,i}, R_{2,i}, R_3, R_{4,i} \subseteq R \)

• Rules
  – \( cr_{p,i}(\tau(X_1), \ldots, \tau(X_n)) = Y/R_{1,i} \cup X/R_{2,i} \)
  – \( cr_{c}(\tau(X_1), \ldots, \tau(X_n)) = Y/R_3 \cup X_i/R_{4,i} \cup \ldots \cup X_n/R_{4,i} \)
Example

- Anna, Bill must do something cooperatively
  - But they don’t trust each other
- Jointly create a proxy
  - Each gives proxy only necessary rights
- In ESPM:
  - Anna, Bill type $a$; proxy type $p$; right $x \in R$
  - $cc(a, a) = p$
  - $cr_{Anna}(a, a, p) = cr_{Bill}(a, a, p) = \emptyset$
  - $cr_{proxy}(a, a, p) = \{ Anna/x, Bill/x \}$

2-Parent Joint Create Suffices

- Goal: emulate 3-parent joint create with 2-parent joint create
- Definition of 3-parent joint create (subjects $P_1$, $P_2$, $P_3$; child $C$):
  - $cc(\tau(P_1), \tau(P_2), \tau(P_3)) = Z \subseteq T$
  - $cr_{P_1}(\tau(P_1), \tau(P_2), \tau(P_3)) = C/R_{1,1} \cup P_1/R_{1,1}$
  - $cr_{P_2}(\tau(P_1), \tau(P_2), \tau(P_3)) = C/R_{2,2} \cup P_2/R_{2,2}$
  - $cr_{P_3}(\tau(P_1), \tau(P_2), \tau(P_3)) = C/R_{3,1} \cup P_3/R_{3,1}$
General Approach

• Define agents for parents and child
  – Agents act as surrogates for parents
  – If create fails, parents have no extra rights
  – If create succeeds, parents, child have exactly same rights as in 3-parent creates
    • Only extra rights are to agents (which are never used again, and so these rights are irrelevant)

Entities and Types

• Parents $P_1, P_2, P_3$ have types $p_1, p_2, p_3$
• Child $C$ of type $c$
• Parent agents $A_1, A_2, A_3$ of types $a_1, a_2, a_3$
• Child agent $S$ of type $s$
• Type $t$ is parentage
  – if $X/t \in \text{dom}(Y)$, $X$ is $Y$’s parent
• Types $t, a_1, a_2, a_3, s$ are new types
Can•Create

- Following added to can•create:
  - $cc(p_1) = a_1$
  - $cc(p_2, a_1) = a_2$
  - $cc(p_3, a_2) = a_3$
    - Parents creating their agents; note agents have maximum of 2 parents
  - $cc(a_3) = s$
    - Agent of all parents creates agent of child
  - $cc(s) = c$
    - Agent of child creates child

Creation Rules

- Following added to create rule:
  - $cr_p(p_1, a_1) = \emptyset$
  - $cr_c(p_1, a_1) = p_1/Rtc$
    - Agent’s parent set to creating parent; agent has all rights over parent
  - $cr_{p\text{first}}(p_2, a_1, a_2) = \emptyset$
  - $cr_{p\text{second}}(p_2, a_1, a_2) = \emptyset$
  - $cr_c(p_2, a_1, a_2) = p_2/Rtc \cup a_1/tc$
    - Agent’s parent set to creating parent and agent; agent has all rights over parent (but not over agent)
Creation Rules

- \( cr_{Pfirst}(p_3, a_2, a_3) = \emptyset \)
- \( cr_{Psecond}(p_3, a_2, a_3) = \emptyset \)
- \( cr_{C}(p_3, a_2, a_3) = p_3/Rtc \cup a_2/tc \)
  - Agent’s parent set to creating parent and agent; agent has all rights over parent (but not over agent)
- \( cr_{P}(a_3, s) = \emptyset \)
- \( cr_{C}(a_3, s) = a_3/tc \)
  - Child’s agent has third agent as parent \( cr_{P}(a_3, s) = \emptyset \)
- \( cr_{P}(s, c) = C/Rtc \)
- \( cr_{C}(s, c) = c/R_3t \)
  - Child’s agent gets full rights over child; child gets \( R_3 \) rights over agent

Link Predicates

- Idea: no tickets to parents until child created
  - Done by requiring each agent to have its own parent rights
    - \( link_1(A_1, A_2) = A_1/t \in \text{dom}(A_2) \land A_2/t \in \text{dom}(A_1) \)
    - \( link_2(A_1, A_3) = A_2/t \in \text{dom}(A_1) \land A_3/t \in \text{dom}(A_1) \)
    - \( link_3(S, A_3) = A_3/t \in \text{dom}(S) \land C/t \in \text{dom}(C) \)
    - \( link_3(A_1, C) = C/t \in \text{dom}(A_1) \)
    - \( link_3(A_2, C) = C/t \in \text{dom}(A_2) \)
    - \( link_3(A_3, C) = C/t \in \text{dom}(A_3) \)
    - \( link_3(A_1, P_1) = P_1/t \in \text{dom}(A_1) \land A_1/t \in \text{dom}(A_1) \)
    - \( link_4(A_2, P_2) = P_2/t \in \text{dom}(A_2) \land A_2/t \in \text{dom}(A_2) \)
    - \( link_4(A_3, P_3) = P_3/t \in \text{dom}(A_3) \land A_3/t \in \text{dom}(A_3) \)
Filter Functions

- \( f_1(a_2, a_1) = a_1/t \cup c/Rtc \)
- \( f_1(a_3, a_2) = a_2/t \cup c/Rtc \)
- \( f_2(s, a_3) = a_3/t \cup c/Rtc \)
- \( f_3(a_1, c) = p_1/R_{4,1} \)
- \( f_3(a_2, c) = p_2/R_{4,2} \)
- \( f_3(a_3, c) = p_3/R_{4,3} \)
- \( f_4(a_1, p_1) = c/R_{1,1} \cup p_1/R_{2,1} \)
- \( f_4(a_2, p_2) = c/R_{1,2} \cup p_2/R_{2,2} \)
- \( f_4(a_3, p_3) = c/R_{1,3} \cup p_3/R_{2,3} \)

Construction

Create \( A_1, A_2, A_3, S, C \); then
- \( P_1 \) has no relevant tickets
- \( P_2 \) has no relevant tickets
- \( P_3 \) has no relevant tickets
- \( A_1 \) has \( P_1/Rtc \)
- \( A_2 \) has \( P_2/Rtc \cup A_1/tc \)
- \( A_3 \) has \( P_3/Rtc \cup A_2/tc \)
- \( S \) has \( A_3/tc \cup C/Rtc \)
- \( C \) has \( C/R_{3} \)
Construction

- Only link$_2$(S, A$_3$) true ⇒ apply $f_2$
  - A$_3$ has P$_3$/Rtc ∪ A$_2$/t ∪ A$_3$/t ∪ C/Rtc
- Now link$_1$(A$_3$, A$_2$) true ⇒ apply $f_1$
  - A$_2$ has P$_2$/Rtc ∪ A$_1$/tc ∪ A$_2$/t ∪ C/Rtc
- Now link$_1$(A$_2$, A$_1$) true ⇒ apply $f_1$
  - A$_1$ has P$_2$/Rtc ∪ A$_1$/tc ∪ A$_1$/t ∪ C/Rtc
- Now all link$_3$s true ⇒ apply $f_3$
  - C has C/R$_3$ ∪ P$_1$/R$_{4,1}$ ∪ P$_2$/R$_{4,2}$ ∪ P$_3$/R$_{4,3}$

Finish Construction

- Now link$_4$s true ⇒ apply $f_4$
  - P$_1$ has C/R$_{1,1}$ ∪ P$_1$/R$_{2,1}$
  - P$_2$ has C/R$_{1,2}$ ∪ P$_2$/R$_{2,2}$
  - P$_3$ has C/R$_{1,3}$ ∪ P$_3$/R$_{2,3}$
- 3-parent joint create gives same rights to P$_1$, P$_2$, P$_3$, C
- If create of C fails, link$_2$ fails, so construction fails
Theorem

- The two-parent joint creation operation can implement an \( n \)-parent joint creation operation with a fixed number of additional types and rights, and augmentations to the link predicates and filter functions.

- **Proof**: by construction, as above
  - Difference is that the two systems need not start at the same initial state

Theorems

- Monotonic ESPM and the monotonic HRU model are equivalent.
- Safety question in ESPM also decidable if acyclic attenuating scheme
Expressiveness

• Graph-based representation to compare models
• Graph
  – Vertex: represents entity, has static type
  – Edge: represents right, has static type
• Graph rewriting rules:
  – Initial state operations create graph in a particular state
  – Node creation operations add nodes, incoming edges
  – Edge adding operations add new edges between existing vertices

Example: 3-Parent Joint Creation

• Simulate with 2-parent
  – Nodes $P_1, P_2, P_3$ parents
  – Create node $C$ with type $c$ with edges of type $e$
  – Add node $A_1$ of type $a$ and edge from $P_1$ to $A_1$ of type $e'$
Next Step

- $A_1, P_2$ create $A_2$; $A_2, P_3$ create $A_3$
- Type of nodes, edges are $a$ and $e'$

Next Step

- $A_3$ creates $S$, of type $a$
- $S$ creates $C$, of type $c$
Last Step

- Edge adding operations:
  - $P_1 \rightarrow A_1 \rightarrow A_2 \rightarrow A_3 \rightarrow S \rightarrow C$: $P_1$ to $C$ edge type $e$
  - $P_2 \rightarrow A_2 \rightarrow A_3 \rightarrow S \rightarrow C$: $P_2$ to $C$ edge type $e$
  - $P_3 \rightarrow A_3 \rightarrow S \rightarrow C$: $P_3$ to $C$ edge type $e$

Definitions

- **Scheme**: graph representation as above
- **Model**: set of schemes
- Schemes $A$, $B$ correspond if graph for both is identical when all nodes with types not in $A$ and edges with types in $A$ are deleted
Example

- Above 2-parent joint creation simulation in scheme \textit{TWO}
- Equivalent to 3-parent joint creation scheme \textit{THREE} in which $P_1, P_2, P_3, C$ are of same type as in \textit{TWO}, and edges from $P_1, P_2, P_3$ to $C$ are of type $e$, and no types $a$ and $e'$ exist in \textit{TWO}

Simulation

Scheme $A$ simulates scheme $B$ iff
- every state $B$ can reach has a corresponding state in $A$ that $A$ can reach; and
- every state that $A$ can reach either corresponds to a state $B$ can reach, or has a successor state that corresponds to a state $B$ can reach
  - The last means that $A$ can have intermediate states not corresponding to states in $B$, like the intermediate ones in \textit{TWO} in the simulation of \textit{THREE}
Expressive Power

- If scheme in $MA$ no scheme in $MB$ can simulate, $MB$ less expressive than $MA$
- If every scheme in $MA$ can be simulated by a scheme in $MB$, $MB$ as expressive as $MA$
- If $MA$ as expressive as $MB$ and vice versa, $MA$ and $MB$ equivalent

Example

- Scheme $A$ in model $M$
  - Nodes $X_1, X_2, X_3$
  - 2-parent joint create
  - 1 node type, 1 edge type
  - No edge adding operations
  - Initial state: $X_1, X_2, X_3$, no edges
- Scheme $B$ in model $N$
  - All same as $A$ except no 2-parent joint create
  - 1-parent create
- Which is more expressive?
Can A Simulate B?

- Scheme A simulates 1-parent create: have both parents be same node
  - Model $M$ as expressive as model $N$

Can B Simulate A?

- Suppose $X_1, X_2$ jointly create $Y$ in $A$
  - Edges from $X_1, X_2$ to $Y$, no edge from $X_3$ to $Y$
- Can $B$ simulate this?
  - Without loss of generality, $X_1$ creates $Y$
  - Must have edge adding operation to add edge from $X_2$ to $Y$
  - One type of node, one type of edge, so operation can add edge between any 2 nodes
No

• All nodes in $A$ have even number of incoming edges
  – 2-parent create adds 2 incoming edges
• Edge adding operation in $B$ that can edge from $X_2$ to $C$ can add one from $X_3$ to $C$
  – $A$ cannot enter this state
  – $B$ cannot transition to a state in which $Y$ has even number of incoming edges
  • No remove rule
• So $B$ cannot simulate $A$; $N$ less expressive than $M$

Theorem

• Monotonic single-parent models are less expressive than monotonic multiparent models
• ESPM more expressive than SPM
  – ESPM multiparent and monotonic
  – SPM monotonic but single parent
Typed Access Matrix Model

- Like ACM, but with set of types $T$
  - All subjects, objects have types
  - Set of types for subjects $TS$
- Protection state is $(S, O, \tau, A)$, where $\tau: O \rightarrow T$ specifies type of each object
  - If $X$ subject, $\tau(X)$ in $TS$
  - If $X$ object, $\tau(X)$ in $T - TS$

Create Rules

- Subject creation
  - create subject $s$ of type $ts$
  - $s$ must not exist as subject or object when operation executed
  - $ts \in TS$
- Object creation
  - create object $o$ of type $to$
  - $o$ must not exist as subject or object when operation executed
  - $to \in T - TS$
Create Subject

- Precondition: \( s \notin S \)
- Primitive command: create subject \( s \) of type \( t \)
- Postconditions:
  - \( S' = S \cup \{ s \}, O' = O \cup \{ s \} \)
  - \((\forall y \in O)[\tau'(y) = \tau(y)], \tau'(s) = t \)
  - \((\forall y \in O')[a'[s, y] = \emptyset], (\forall x \in S')[a'[x, s] = \emptyset]\)
  - \((\forall x \in S)(\forall y \in O)[a'[x, y] = a[x, y]]\)

Create Object

- Precondition: \( o \notin O \)
- Primitive command: create object \( o \) of type \( t \)
- Postconditions:
  - \( S' = S, O' = O \cup \{ o \} \)
  - \((\forall y \in O)[\tau'(y) = \tau(y)], \tau'(o) = t \)
  - \((\forall x \in S')[a'[x, o] = \emptyset]\)
  - \((\forall x \in S)(\forall y \in O)[a'[x, y] = a[x, y]]\)
Definitions

- MTAM Model: TAM model without delete, destroy
  - MTAM is Monotonic TAM
- \( \alpha(x_1:t_1, \ldots, x_n:t_n) \) create command
  - \( t_i \) child type in \( \alpha \) if any of create subject \( x_i \) of type \( t_i \) or create object \( x_i \) of type \( t_i \) occur in \( \alpha \)
  - \( t_i \) parent type otherwise

Cyclic Creates

command havoc(s_1 : u, s_2 : u, o_1 : v, o_2 : v, o_3 : w, o_4 : w)
  create subject \( s_1 \) of type \( u \);
  create object \( o_1 \) of type \( v \);
  create object \( o_3 \) of type \( w \);
  enter \( r \) into \( a[s_2, s_1] \);
  enter \( r \) into \( a[s_2, o_2] \);
  enter \( r \) into \( a[s_2, o_4] \)
end
Creation Graph

- \( u, v, w \) child types
- \( u, v, w \) also parent types
- Graph: lines from parent types to child types
- This one has cycles

Theorems

- Safety decidable for systems with acyclic MTAM schemes
- Safety for acyclic ternary MATM decidable in time polynomial in the size of initial ACM
  - “ternary” means commands have no more than 3 parameters
  - Equivalent in expressive power to MTAM
Key Points

- Safety problem undecidable
- Limiting scope of systems can make problem decidable
- Types critical to safety problem’s analysis

Overview

- Overview
- Policies
- Trust
- Nature of Security Mechanisms
- Policy Expression Languages
- Limits on Secure and Precise Mechanisms
Security Policy

• Policy partitions system states into:
  – Authorized (secure)
    • These are states the system can enter
  – Unauthorized (nonsecure)
    • If the system enters any of these states, it’s a security violation

• Secure system
  – Starts in authorized state
  – Never enters unauthorized state

Confidentiality

• X set of entities, I information
• I has confidentiality property with respect to X if no x in X can obtain information from I
• I can be disclosed to others
• Example:
  – X set of students
  – I final exam answer key
  – I is confidential with respect to X if students cannot obtain final exam answer key
Integrity

- X set of entities, I information
- I has \textit{integrity} property with respect to X if all x in X trust information in I
- Types of integrity:
  - trust I, its conveyance and protection (data integrity)
  - I information about origin of something or an identity (origin integrity, authentication)
  - I resource: means resource functions as it should (assurance)

Availability

- X set of entities, I resource
- I has \textit{availability} property with respect to X if all x in X can access I
- Types of availability:
  - traditional: x gets access or not
  - quality of service: promised a level of access (for example, a specific level of bandwidth) and not meet it, even though some access is achieved
Policy Models

- Abstract description of a policy or class of policies
- Focus on points of interest in policies
  - Security levels in multilevel security models
  - Separation of duty in Clark-Wilson model
  - Conflict of interest in Chinese Wall model

Types of Security Policies

- Military (governmental) security policy
  - Policy primarily protecting confidentiality
- Commercial security policy
  - Policy primarily protecting integrity
- Confidentiality policy
  - Policy protecting only confidentiality
- Integrity policy
  - Policy protecting only integrity
Integrity and Transactions

- Begin in consistent state
  - “Consistent” defined by specification
- Perform series of actions (transaction)
  - Actions cannot be interrupted
  - If actions complete, system in consistent state
  - If actions do not complete, system reverts to beginning (consistent) state

Trust

Administrator installs patch
1. Trusts patch came from vendor, not tampered with in transit
2. Trusts vendor tested patch thoroughly
3. Trusts vendor’s test environment corresponds to local environment
4. Trusts patch is installed correctly
Trust in Formal Verification

• Gives formal mathematical proof that given input i, program P produces output o as specified
• Suppose a security-related program S formally verified to work with operating system O
• What are the assumptions?

Trust in Formal Methods

1. Proof has no errors
   • Bugs in automated theorem provers
2. Preconditions hold in environment in which S is to be used
3. S transformed into executable S’ whose actions follow source code
   – Compiler bugs, linker/loader/library problems
4. Hardware executes S’ as intended
   – Hardware bugs (Pentium f00f bug, for example)
Types of Access Control

- Discretionary Access Control (DAC, IBAC)
  - individual user sets access control mechanism to allow or deny access to an object
- Mandatory Access Control (MAC)
  - system mechanism controls access to object, and individual cannot alter that access
- Originator Controlled Access Control (ORCON)
  - originator (creator) of information controls who can access information

Question

- Policy disallows cheating
  - Includes copying homework, with or without permission
- CS class has students do homework on computer
- Anne forgets to read-protect her homework file
- Bill copies it
- Who cheated?
  - Anne, Bill, or both?
Answer Part 1

- Bill cheated
  - Policy forbids copying homework assignment
  - Bill did it
  - System entered unauthorized state (Bill having a copy of Anne’s assignment)
- If not explicit in computer security policy, certainly implicit
  - Not credible that a unit of the university allows something that the university as a whole forbids, unless the unit explicitly says so

Answer Part #2

- Anne didn’t protect her homework
  - Not required by security policy
- She didn’t breach security
- If policy said students had to read-protect homework files, then Anna did breach security
  - She didn’t do so
Mechanisms

- Entity or procedure that enforces some part of the security policy
  - Access controls (like bits to prevent someone from reading a homework file)
  - Disallowing people from bringing CDs and floppy disks into a computer facility to control what is placed on systems