IS 2150 / TEL 2810 Information Security & Privacy



James Joshi Associate Professor, SIS

> Lecture 4 Jan 30, 2013

Access Control Model Foundational Results

Objective

Understand the basic results of the HRU model

- Saftey issue
- Turing machine
- Undecidability

Safety Problem: *formally*

Given

- Initial state $X_0 = (S_0, O_0, A_0)$
- Set of primitive commands c
- *r* is not in *A₀*[*s*, *o*]
- Can we reach a state X_n where
 - $\exists s, o \text{ such that } A_n[s, o] \text{ includes a right } r \text{ not in } A_0[s, o]?$
 - If so, the system is not safe
 - But is "safe" secure?

Undecidable Problems

Decidable Problem

- A decision problem can be solved by an algorithm that halts on all inputs in a finite number of steps.
- Undecidable Problem
 - A problem that cannot be solved for all cases by any algorithm whatsoever

Decidability Results (Harrison, Ruzzo, Ullman)

Theorem:

Given a system where each command consists of a single *primitive* command (mono-operational), there exists an algorithm that will determine if a protection system with initial state X₀ is safe with respect to right *r*.

Decidability Results (Harrison, Ruzzo, Ullman)

- Proof: determine minimum commands k to leak
 - Delete/destroy: Can't leak
 - Create/enter: new subjects/objects "equal", so treat all new subjects as one
 - No test for absence of right
 - Tests on A[s₁, o₁] and A[s₂, o₂] have same result as the same tests on A[s₁, o₁] and A[s₁, o₂] = A[s₁, o₂] ∪A[s₂, o₂]
 - If *n* rights leak possible, must be able to leak $k = n(|S_0|+1)(|O_0|+1)+1$ commands
 - Enumerate all possible states to decide



After execution of c_b



After two creates

Just use first create

Decidability Results (Harrison, Ruzzo, Ullman)

- Proof: determine minimum commands k to leak
 - Delete/destroy: Can't leak
 - Create/enter: new subjects/objects "equal", so treat all new subjects as one
 - No test for absence of right
 - Tests on A[s₁, o₁] and A[s₂, o₂] have same result as the same tests on A[s₁, o₁] and A[s₁, o₂] = A[s₁, o₂] ∪A[s₂, o₂]
 - If *n* rights leak possible, must be able to leak $k = n(|S_0|+1)(|O_0|+1)+1$ commands
 - Enumerate all possible states to decide

Decidability Results (Harrison, Ruzzo, Ullman)

- It is undecidable if a given state of a given protection system is safe for a given generic right
- For proof need to know Turing machines and halting problem

Turing Machine & halting problem

The halting problem:

 Given a description of an algorithm and a description of its initial arguments, determine whether the algorithm, when executed with these arguments, ever halts (the alternative is that it runs forever without halting).

Turing Machine & Safety problem

Theorem:

 It is undecidable if a given state of a given protection system is safe for a given generic right

Reduce TM to Safety problem

- If Safety problem is decidable then it implies that TM halts (for all inputs) – showing that the halting problem is decidable (contradiction)
- TM is an abstract model of computer

Alan Turing in 1936

Turing Machine

- TM consists of
 - A tape divided into cells; infinite in one direction
 - A set of tape symbols *M*
 - M contains a special blank symbol b
 - A set of states K
 - A head that can read and write symbols
 - An action table that tells the machine how to transition
 - What symbol to write
 - How to move the head ('L' for left and 'R' for right)
 - What is the next state



Current state is *k* Current symbol is *C*

Turing Machine

- Transition function $\delta(k, m) = (k', m', L)$:
 - In state k, symbol m on tape location is replaced by symbol m',
 - Head moves one cell to the left, and TM enters state k'
- Halting state is q_f
 - TM halts when it enters this state



Current state is *k* Current symbol is *C*

Let $\delta(k, C) = (k_1, X, R)$ where k_1 is the next state



Current symbol is C



TM2Safety Reduction

- Proof: Reduce TM to safety problem
 - Symbols, States \Rightarrow rights
 - Tape cell \Rightarrow subject
 - Cell s_i has $A \Rightarrow s_i$ has A rights on itself
 - Cell $s_k \Rightarrow s_k$ has end rights on itself
 - State *p*, head at *s_i* ⇒ *s_i* has *p* rights on itself
 - Distinguished Right own:
 - $S_i \text{ owns } s_i + 1 \text{ for } 1 \le i < k$



	<i>s</i> ₁	<i>s</i> ₂	<i>s</i> ₃	<i>s</i> ₄	
<i>s</i> ₁	A	own			
<i>s</i> ₂		В	own		
<i>s</i> ₃			C k	own	
<i>s</i> ₄				D end	

Command Mapping (Left move)



Current symbol is C

 $\delta(k, \mathbf{C}) = (k_1, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{L})$

$\delta(k, C) = (k_1, X, L)$

If head is not in leftmost **command** $c_{k,C}(s_i, s_{i-1})$ if own in $a[s_{i-1}, s_i]$ and k in $a[s_i, s_i]$ and C in $a[s_i, s_i]$ then delete k from $A[s_i, s_i]$; delete C from $A[s_i, s_i]$; enter X into $A[s_i, s_i]$; enter k_1 into $A[s_{i-1}, s_{i-1}];$ End

	<i>s</i> ₁	<i>s</i> ₂	<i>s</i> ₃	<i>S</i> ₄	
<i>s</i> ₁	А	own			
<i>s</i> ₂		В	own		
<i>s</i> ₃			C k	own	
<i>s</i> ₄				D end	

Command Mapping (Left move)



Current state is k_1

Current symbol is D head

$$\delta(k, \mathbf{C}) = (k_1, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{L})$$

$$\delta(k, C) = (k_1, X, L)$$

If head is not in leftmost command $c_{k,C}(s_i, s_{i-1})$ if own in $a[s_{i-1}, s_i]$ and k in $a[s_i, s_i]$ and C in $a[s_i, s_i]$ then delete k from $A[s_i, s_i]$; delete C from $A[s_i, s_i]$; enter X into $A[s_i, s_i]$; enter k_1 into $A[s_{i-1}, s_{i-1}]$; End

If head is in leftmost both s_i and s_{i-1} are s_1

	<i>s</i> ₁	<i>s</i> ₂	<i>s</i> ₃	<i>S</i> ₄	
<i>s</i> ₁	A	own			
<i>s</i> ₂		B k_1	own		
<i>s</i> ₃			X	own	
<i>s</i> ₄				D end	

Command Mapping (Right move)

head

 $\delta(k, \mathbf{C}) = (k_1, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{R})$

Current symbol is C

$$\delta(k, C) = (k_1, X, R)$$

command $c_{k,C}(s_i, s_{i+1})$ if own in $a[s_i, s_{i+1}]$ and kin $a[s_i, s_i]$ and C in $a[s_i, s_i]$ then

delete k from $A[s_i, s_i]$; delete C from $A[s_i, s_i]$; enter X into $A[s_i, s_i]$; enter k_1 into $A[s_{i+1}, s_{i+1}]$; end

	<i>s</i> ₁	<i>s</i> ₂	<i>s</i> ₃	<i>S</i> ₄	
<i>s</i> ₁	A	own			
<i>s</i> ₂		В	own		
<i>s</i> ₃			C k	own	
<i>s</i> ₄				D end	

Command Mapping (Right move)

$$\begin{array}{c|c} \mathbf{Y} & \mathbf{A} & \mathbf{B} & \mathbf{C} & \mathbf{L} \\ \hline \mathbf{x} \text{ state is } k_1 & \mathbf{A} \end{array}$$

2

Current symbol is C

$$\delta(k, \mathbf{C}) = (k_1, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{R})$$

head

$$\delta(k, C) = (k_1, X, R)$$

command $c_{k,C}(s_i, s_{i+1})$ if *own* in $a[s_i, s_{i+1}]$ and kin $a[s_i, s_i]$ and C in $a[s_i, s_i]$ then delete k from $A[s_i, s_i]$.

delete k from $A[s_i, s_i]$; delete C from $A[s_i, s_i]$; enter X into $A[s_i, s_i]$; enter k_1 into $A[s_{i+1}, s_{i+1}]$; end

	<i>s</i> ₁	<i>s</i> ₂	<i>s</i> ₃	<i>s</i> ₄	
<i>s</i> ₁	А	own			
<i>s</i> ₂		В	own		
<i>s</i> ₃			X	own	
<i>s</i> ₄				D k_1 end	





Rest of Proof

- Protection system exactly simulates a TM
 - Exactly 1 *end* right in ACM
 - Only 1 right corresponds to a state
 - Thus, at most 1 applicable command in each configuration of the TM
- If TM enters state q_{fr} then right has leaked
- If safety question decidable, then represent TM as above and determine if q_f leaks
 - Leaks halting state \Rightarrow halting state in the matrix \Rightarrow Halting state reached
- Conclusion: safety question undecidable

Other results

- For protection system without the create primitives, (i.e., delete create primitive); the safety question is complete in P-SPACE
- It is undecidable whether a given configuration of a given monotonic protection system is safe for a given generic right
 - Delete destroy, delete primitives;
 - The system becomes monotonic as they only increase in size and complexity
- The safety question for biconditional monotonic protection systems is undecidable
- The safety question for monoconditional, monotonic protection systems is decidable
- The safety question for monoconditional protection systems with create, enter, delete (and no destroy) is decidable.