

Composite Decentralized Access Control

Petar Tsankov, Srdjan Marinovic, Mohammad Torabi Dashti, David Basin

Institute of Information Security ETH Zurich

Example: SweGrid

Goal

Provides computational and storage resources to researchers





Access Control Requirements

- A project leader delegates his authority over resources to principals
- A project leader composes the principals' policies (e.g., using permit-override)

Delegation

Multiple principals can issue access rights



Delegation

Multiple principals can issue access rights



Decentralized Access Control

Composition

Policy decisions in large-scale systems

Grant, Deny, Not-applicable, Conflict



Composition

Policy decisions in large-scale systems

– Grant, Deny, Not-applicable, Conflict



Composite Access Control

System Model







Systems and standards	
Formal foundations	

	Delegation
Systems and standards	SecPAL for Grid KeyNote PDP (RFC 2704)
Formal foundations	RT ('01) DKAL ('08) •••

	Delegation	Composition
Systems and standards	SecPAL for Grid KeyNote PDP (RFC 2704)	XACML v2.0
Formal foundations	RT ('01) DKAL ('08) •••	PBel ('08) D-Algebra ('09) PTaCL ('12)

	Delegation	Composition	Delegation + Composition
Systems and standards	SecPAL for Grid KeyNote PDP (RFC 2704)	XACML v2.0	SweGrid XACML v3.0 ('13) WSO2 ID Server
Formal foundations	RT ('01) DKAL ('08) •••	PBel ('08) D-Algebra ('09) PTaCL ('12)	

	Delegation	Composition	Delegation + Composition
Systems and standards	SecPAL for Grid KeyNote PDP (RFC 2704)	XACML v2.0	SweGrid XACML v3.0 ('13) WSO2 ID Server
Formal foundations	RT ('01) DKAL ('08) •••	PBel ('08) D-Algebra ('09) PTaCL ('12)	BelLog

How to Build Access Control Systems



- Formal semantics
- Support for delegation
- Support for composition



- → Analysis language
- Decision algorithms



 Efficient evaluation algorithm

How to Build Access Control Systems



- Formal semantics
- Support for delegation
- Support for composition



- → Analysis language
- Decision algorithms



 Efficient evaluation algorithm



т I



т I



т I



1 I



Transitive delegation $pol(Req)@X \leftarrow pol(Req)@Y, delegate(Y)@X$

Transitive delegation $pol(Req)@X \leftarrow pol(Req)@Y, delegate(Y)@X$

Policy targets

 $polA(Req) \leftarrow target(Req) \blacktriangleright polB(Req)$

Transitive delegation $pol(Req)@X \leftarrow pol(Req)@Y, delegate(Y)@X$

Policy targets	$polA(Req) \leftarrow target(Req) \triangleright polB(Req)$
----------------	---

Agreement

 $polA(Req) \leftarrow polB(Req) \oplus polC(Req)$

Transitive delegation $pol(Req)@X \leftarrow pol(Req)@Y, delegate(Y)@X$

Policy targets	$polA(Req) \leftarrow target(Req) \blacktriangleright polB(Req)$

Agreement $polA(Req) \leftarrow polB(Req) \oplus polC(Req)$

Conflict-override $polA(Req) \leftarrow polB(Req)[\top \mapsto polC(Req)]$



How to Build Access Control Systems



- Formal semantics
- → Support for delegation
- Support for composition



Decision algorithms



 Efficient evaluation algorithm





























Syntax

(question) $(c \Rightarrow P_1 \preceq P_2)$ (condition) $c ::= a(X) = \mathbf{t} \mid \exists X. \ c \mid \neg c \mid \cdots$

 Is policy P2 more permissive than P1 for all inputs that satisfy the condition c?



Syntax

(question) $(c \Rightarrow P_1 \preceq P_2)$ (condition) $c ::= a(X) = \mathbf{t} \mid \exists X. \ c \mid \neg c \mid \cdots$

 Is policy P2 more permissive than P1 for all inputs that satisfy the condition c?

For a given input:





Syntax

(question) $(c \Rightarrow P_1 \preceq P_2)$ (condition) $c ::= a(X) = \mathbf{t} \mid \exists X. \ c \mid \neg c \mid \cdots$

 Is policy P2 more permissive than P1 for all inputs that satisfy the condition c?

For a given input:





Syntax

(question) $(c \Rightarrow P_1 \preceq P_2)$ (condition) $c ::= a(X) = \mathbf{t} \mid \exists X. \ c \mid \neg c \mid \cdots$

 Is policy P2 more permissive than P1 for all inputs that satisfy the condition c?



Example: Analysis Question



Requirement

If the requester is a project leader, then grant access.

Example: Analysis Question





Analysis



Theorem 1 Policy containment is undecidable



Theorem 1 Policy containment is undecidable

Theorem 2 Policy containment for unary-input policies* is in CO-NEXP-COMPLETE

*Unary-input policies

- **Example:** $pol(Sub, Obj) \leftarrow leader(Sub), pub(Obj)$



Theorem 1 Policy containment is undecidable

Theorem 2 Policy containment for unary-input policies* is in CO-NEXP-COMPLETE

Theorem 3

Policy containment for a finite universe is in CO-NP-COMPLETE

*Unary-input policies

- **Example:** $pol(Sub, Obj) \leftarrow leader(Sub), pub(Obj)$

How to Build Access Control Systems



- Formal semantics
- Support for delegation
- Support for composition



- → Analysis language
- Decision algorithms



 Efficient evaluation algorithm



Constructing PDPs



Theorem 4

Policy entailment is in **PTIME**

Policy Interpreter

http://bellog.org

•	BelLog Interpreter – Google Chrome	\odot \otimes \otimes
BelLog Interpreter	×	
· → C 🗋 bellog.	org/bellog/	☆ 🖬 🕚 🔳
BelLog Poli	cy Interpreter	2
Enter a policy or load	i one of the examples located on the left	RBAC POLICY
		FILE POLICY
		EXAMPLE 1
		EXAMPLE 2
Request		
Type a request	EVALUATE	

GitHub

https://github.com/ptsankov/bellog/

Limitations



- Analysis of administrative changes
- Analysis complexity and tool support
- Usability

BelLog Contributions

