



A Role Based Administration Model For Attribute

Xin Jin, Ram Krishnan, Ravi Sandhu

SRAS, Sep 19, 2012







Motivation

- Background
- Proposed Approach
- Discussion and Future Work



Motivation



- Attribute Based Access Control provide flexibility and scalabilities for distributed access control
 - Role based trust management (RT)[Oakland02]
 - Unified ABAC model (ABAC-alpha) [DBSEC12]
 - Attribute based Encryption (ABE) [CCS06]
 - Usage control model (UCON) [TISSEC]
 - Logical based framework for ABAC [FMSE04], etc.
- > What is user attribute(credential, certificate, etc.)?
 - ✤ Name, address, country...
 - ✤ ID, clearance...





- Much effort in how to use and store user attributes.
 - Authorization policy evaluate attribute of subject and object in the request (s, o) (ABAC-ALPHA,UCON, Logical based framework for ABAC)
 - Attribute Encryption (ABE, PKI)
 - Industry Implementation Standard (XACML, SAML, etc.)
- Not enough on user attribute management
 - Who is authorized to assign user attributes?
 Who is authorized to assign value for Salary(Alice)?

♦ Can Bob say that Salary(Alice)=3000?

How should permissions be assigned to administrators?
 Manually one by one? No!





- Effective user attribute administration model needed
 Ease of Administration one of desired features
- Role based Access Control



Good candidate for user attribute Administration
 Proved ease of administration
 Efficient safety analysis
 Sizable literature, etc.







User role assignment model (URA97)



Example: Pr ogrammanager { prj1leader, proj2leader }

User attributes

- Atomic: User can only have one value for this kind of attribute. E.g. user id, clearance, etc.
- Set: User can be assigned multiple values. E.g. role, phonenumber, etc.
- Range(ua), attType(ua)



Proposed Approach



- Generalize Role as one of user attributes
 - Difference between role and user attribute
 - Role represents permissions while attributes do not (Alice's role is Program Chair VS Alice's age is 23)
 - Role has hierarchy while attribute may not (Role: CEO is senior role of employee. Attribute: Address)
 - Difference between atomic user attributes and set-valued user attributes
 - Assign new value to atomic user attribute automatically remove old value
 - Add new values to set-valued attribute does not guarantee permissions to delete existing attribute values.



Proposed Approach



Permissions to each administrative role

- > Add value to set-valued user attributes
- Delete value from set-valued attributes
- Assign value to atomic-valued attributes

Specify the three permission sets for each role

- > Add value to set-valued user attributes
- Delete value from set-valued attributes
- > Assign value to atomic-valued attributes



Proposed Approach(GURA₀)

> Add values to set-valued user attributes:

 $\forall sua \in SUA. can_add_{sua} \subseteq AR \times EXPR(sua) \times 2^{Range(sua)}$

AR: set of administrative roles
SUA: set of set-valued user attributes
EXPR(sua): logical expression composed of user attribute sua



Delete values from set-valued user attributes:

 $\forall sua \in SUA. can_delete_{sua} \subseteq AR \times EXPR(sua) \times 2^{Range(sua)}$

AR: set of administrative roles
SUA: set of set-valued user attribute
EXPR(sua): logical expression composed of user attribute *sua*



Proposed Approach(GURA₀)

>Assign value to atomic-valued user attributes:

 \forall sua \in AUA. can_assign_{aua} \subseteq AR \times EXPR(aua) \times 2^{Range(aua)}

AR: set of administrative roles
 AUA: set of atomic-valued user attributes
 EXPR(aua): logical expression composed of user attribute *aua*







Common Expression Language

 $\begin{array}{l} \varphi ::= \varphi \land \varphi \mid \varphi \lor \varphi \mid (\varphi) \mid \neg \varphi \mid \exists \ \mathbf{x} \in \operatorname{set.} \varphi \mid \\ \forall \ \mathbf{x} \in \operatorname{set.} \varphi \mid \operatorname{set \ set \ compare \ set \ | \ atomic \ \in \ set \ | \\ atomic \ \notin \ set \ | \ atomic \ atomic \ compare \ atomic \\ atomic \ compare \ ::= \ < \ | \ = \ | \ \leq \ | \ \neq \\ \operatorname{set \ compare \ ::= \ } \ \subset \ | \ \subseteq \ | \ \not \leq \end{array}$

Example: set-valued attributes in GURA0 EXPR(SUA) is specified using an instance of the above language where

set ::= sua(u) | constantSet atomic ::= constantAtomic







Users And User Attributes

Administrative Roles































>Limited Expressive Power

Expression(ua) ONLY composed using the user attribute in context is not enough. Example: PrjLeader1 is only authorized to add employee whose experience with Java is more than 3 years and whose skills include

C++.

Least Privilege is not achieved Expression(ua) CAN NOT restrict users to the least set. Need other user attributes to compose the expression.





➢ Further Generalization

 $\forall sua \in SUA. can_add_{sua} \subseteq AR \times EXPR(sua) \times 2^{Range(sua)}$

 $\forall sua \in SUA. can_add_{sua} \subseteq AR \times EXPR(UA) \times 2^{Range(sua)}$

EXPR(UA): logical expression composed of all user attribute *ua in UA*



Further Generalization for GURA1:

$\forall sua \in SUA. can_delete_{sua} \subseteq AR \times EXPR(UA) \times 2^{Range(sua)}$

 $\forall aua \in AUA. can_assign_{aua} \subseteq AR \times EXPR(UA) \times 2^{Range(aua)}$







Example using GURA1

Table 5: Examples $can_add \ relation \ for \ attribute \ involved prj:$ (prj1leader, prj2 \notin involved prj(u) \land training passed(u) =true \land clearance(u) > S \land C \in skills(u), {prj1})

 $\begin{array}{ll} (prj2leader, \; prj1 \notin involvedprj(u) \land trainingpassed(u) = \\ true \land clearance(u) > S \land C \in skills(u), \{prj2\}) \end{array}$

can_add relation for attribute skill: (secretary, NULL, {C,C++, Java})

 $can_delete \ relation \ for \ attribute \ involved prj:$ (prj1leader, prj1 \in involved prj(u), {prj1}) (prj2leader, prj2 \in involved prj(u), {prj2})

can_delete relation for attribute skill: (secretary, NULL, {C, C++, Java})

can_assign relation for attribute trainingpassed: (trainingmanager, NULL, {true, false})

can_assign relation for attribute clearance: (humanmanager, NULL, {TS, S, C, U})



Advantages Advantages of RBAC inherited

Limitations

- > Awkward for distributed administration of user attributes
- For fine-grained user attribute administration, many roles with slight different set of permissions need to defined.

Future Work

- Delegation
- Attribute based user attribute management





Any Questions?