Introduction to Computer Security

Chapter 4: Access Control

Chi-Yu Li (2020 Spring)
Computer Science Department
National Chiao Tung University

Definition of Computer Security (RFC 4949)

Measures that implement and assure security services in a computer system, particularly those that assure access control service.

Access control: the central element of computer security

Principal Objectives of Computer Security

- Prevent unauthorized users from gaining access to resources
- Prevent legitimate users from accessing resources in an unauthorized manner


Enable legitimate users to access resources in an authorized manner

Outline

- Access Control Principles
- Subjects, Objects, and Access Rights
- Discretionary Access Control
- Example: Unix File Access Control
- Role-Based Access Control
- Attribute-Based Access Control
- Case Study: RBAC System for a Bank

Access Control Context

- Authentication
 - □ Verifying that user/system credentials are valid
- Authorization
 - ☐ Granting a right or permission to a system entity to access a system resource
- Audit
 - An independent examination of system records and activities
 - Test adequacy of system controls
 - Ensure compliance with established policy and operational procedures
 - Detect breaches in security
 - Recommend any indicated changes in control, policy and procedures



Access Control Policies

- Discretionary access control (DAC)
 - Based on the requestor's identity
 - ☐ Access on rules stating what requestors are (or are not) allowed to do
 - Why discretionary?
 - An entity might have access rights to enable another entity to access some resource
- Mandatory access control (MAC)
 - Based on security clearances of system entities
 - Access on security labels of resources
 - Why mandatory?
 - An entity that has clearance to access a resource may not enable another entity to access that resource

Access Control Policies (Cont.)

- Role-based access control (RBAC)
 - Based on the users' roles
 - ☐ Access on rules stating what accesses are allowed to given roles

- Attribute-based access control (ABAC)
 - Based on the users' attributes, the accessed resource, and current environmental conditions

Basic Elements

Subject

An entity capable of accessing objects

Three classes

- Owner
- Group
- World (include all users)

Object

A resource to which access is controlled

Access Rights

Describes the way in which a subject may access an object

Could include:

- Read
- Write
- Execute
- Delete
- Create
- Search

Discretionary Access Control (DAC)

A general approach: access matrix

OBJECTS

☐ Subjects vs. Objects

■ Each entry: access right

User A

SUBJECTS User B

User C


| File 1 | File 2 | File 3 | File 4 |
|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Own Read Write | | Own Read Write | |
| Read | Own Read Write | Write | Read |
| Read Write | Read | | Own Read Write |

In practice, an access matrix is usually sparse!

Access matrix


Decomposition Method I

- Access control lists (ACL): decomposed by columns (objects)
 - ☐ For each object, an ACL lists users and their permitted access rights
 - Default set of rights: users that are not explicitly listed
 - □ Convenient: determining which subjects have which access rights to a particular resource
 - ☐ <u>Inconvenient</u>: determining the access rights available to a specific user



Decomposition Method II

- Capability tickets: decomposed by rows (subjects)
 - A capability ticket specifies authorized objects and operations for a particular user
 - ☐ Convenient/Inconvenient: opposite to ACLs
- Have greater security problem than ACLs. Why?
 - ☐ Tickets may be dispersed around the system
 - Integrity of the ticket must be protected, guaranteed, and unforgeable
 - Two solutions
 - OS holds all tickets on behalf of users
 - An unforgeable token in the capability



Another Approach: Authorization Table [SAND94]

- Not sparse and more convenient than either ACLs or capability lists
- A relational database can easily implement an authorization table of this type
- Any drawback?

| Subject | Access Mode | Object |
|---------|---|--------------------------|
| A | Own | File 1 |
| A | Read | File 1 |
| A | Write | File 1 |
| 1000 | 2.100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 | AT PACKAGE MACAGE (SPEC) |
| A | Own | File 3 |
| Α | Read | File 3 |
| Α | Write | File 3 |
| В | Read | File 1 |
| В | Own | File 2 |
| В | Read | File 2 |
| В | Write | File 2 |
| В | Write | File 3 |
| В | Read | File 4 |
| С | Read | File 1 |
| С | Write | File 1 |
| С | Read | File 2 |
| С | Own | File 4 |
| С | Read | File 4 |
| С | Write | File 4 |

A General Access Control Model for DAC

- Three requirements
 - Representing the protection state
 - **□** Enforcing access rights
 - ☐ Allowing subjects to alter the protection state in certain ways
- Concepts
 - ☐ As usual: a set of subjects, objects, and rules
 - New: protection states
- Protection states
 - ☐ Processes: delete, stop (block), and wake up
 - □ Devices: read/write, operation control, and block/unblock
 - Memory locations or regions: read/write
 - Subjects: grant or delete access rights of objects

Example: Extended Access Control Matrix

| OBJECTS | | | | | | | | |
|----------|-------|-------|----------------|-----------|----------------|--------------|-------|-------|
| subjects | | files | | processes | | disk drivers | | |
| S_1 | S_2 | S_3 | F ₁ | F_2 | P ₁ | P_2 | D_1 | D_2 |

OD IECTS


| | S ₁ | control | owner | owner control | read * | read owner | wakeup | wakeup | seek | owner |
|----------|----------------|---------|---------|------------------|---------|---------------|--------|--------|-------|--------|
| SUBJECTS | S_2 | | control | | write * | execute | | | owner | seek * |
| | S_3 | | | control | | write | stop | | | |

* - copy flag set

Example: Access Control Function

 Every access by a subject to an object is mediated by the controller for that object

 Decisions are based on access matrix monitor



More Flexible Model: Protection Domains

- A set of objects together with access rights to those objects
 - □ e.g., the access matrix
 - A row defines a protection domain
 - Each user has a protection domain → Any processes spawned by the user have access rights of the same domain

Do the processes really need all the access rights?

- Recall security design principles: Least privilege
 - Every process and every user of the system should operate using the least set of privileges necessary to perform the task

Protection Domains (Cont.)

- More general concept: minimize the access rights that any user or process has at any one time
 - □ e.g., A user: spawns processes with a subset of the access rights of the user
 - Limit the capability of the processes
- Association between a process and a domain can be static or dynamic
 - e.g., A process: a sequence of procedures require different access rights
- One form: distinction mode in many OSes (e.g., UNIX)
 - □ User mode: certain areas of memory are protected and certain instructions may not be executed
 - □ Kernel mode

Example: UNIX File Access Control

UNIX files are administered using inodes (index nodes)

- An inode: a control structure with key information for a particular file
- Several file names may be associated with a single inode; inode and file are 1-1 mapping
- File attributes, permissions and control information are sorted in the inode
- On the disk there is an inode table, or inode list, that contains the inodes of all the files in the file system
- When a file is opened its inode is brought into main memory and stored in a memory resident inode table

Directories are structured in a hierarchical tree

- May contain files and/or other directories
- Simply a file: contains file names plus pointers to associated inodes


Traditional UNIX File Access Control

- UNIX user: a unique user identification number (user ID)
 - ☐ A member of a primary group, and possibly other groups
 - Each group is identified by a group ID
- Each file/directory: 12 protection bits
 - ☐ First 9 bits: read, write, execute
 - □ Last 3 bits: setUID, setGID, and sticky





other::---



- SetUID/SetGID bits
 - ☐ Known as the "effective user ID" and "effective group ID"
 - ☐ System temporarily grants a real user with the rights of the file owner/group in addition to the real user's rights
 - **□** For executable files
 - Only effective while the program is being executed
 - Allows users to run programs with temporarily elevated privileges to perform a specific task
 - e.g., the ping command: need access to networking privileges that a normal user cannot access
 - □ For directories
 - SetGID: newly created files will inherit the group of this directory, rather than the primary group ID of the user who created this file
 - SetUID is ignored
 - Security risk?

■ Examples: passwd and ping

```
dinux1:~ [83x25]
Connection Edit View Window Option Help
[chiyuli@linux1 ~]$ stat -c "%a %U:%G %n" /usr/bin/passwd
4755 root:root /usr/bin/passwd
[chiyuli@linux1 ~]$ stat -c "%a %U:%G %n" /etc/passwd
644 root:root /etc/passwd
[chiyuli@linux1 ~]$ stat -c "%a %U:%G %n" /etc/shadow
0 root:root /etc/shadow
[chiyuli@linux1 ~]$ passwd
Please enter your old LDAP(Linux/FreeBSD) password:
chiyuli@linux1:~ [83x25]
Connection Edit View Window Option Help
[chiyuli@linux1 ~]$ stat -c "%a %U:%G %n" /bin/ping
755 root:root /bin/ping
[chiyuli@linux1 ~]$ getcap /bin/ping
/bin/ping = cap net admin,cap net raw+p
[chiyuli@linux1 ~]$ getcap /usr/bin/passwd
[chiyuli@linux1 ~]$
```

setuid: 4

setgid: 2

- Sticky bit
 - ☐ Files: the system should retain the file contents in memory following execution (no longer used)
 - □ Directories: only the owner of any file in the directory can rename, move, or delete that file
 - Useful for managing files in shared temporary directories
- Superuser
 - Exempts from the usual file access control constraints
 - Needs great care on the programs owned by and setuid set to "superuser"

- What issues does this access scheme have?
 - □ Consider one scenario
 - Read access for file X to Users A and B
 - Read access for file Y to Users B and C
 - □ Need at least two user groups
 - □ What if there are a large number of different groupings of users requiring a range of access rights to different files?
- No scalability: unwieldly and difficult to manage

Modern UNIX Access Control: Access Control Lists (ACLs)


- Supported by many modern UNIX-based OSes
 - □ e.g., FreeBSD, OpenBSD, Linux, and Solaris
 - Extended ACL vs. minimal ACL (traditional)

FreeBSD

- ☐ Any number of users and groups can be assigned to a file
 - Each with three protection bits
- A file need not have an ACL; may be protected solely by traditional access control
- An additional protection bit: whether the file has an extended ACL

Modern UNIX Access Control (Cont.)

- Extended ACLs are used with the following strategies
 - Owner and other classes remain the same
 - ☐ Group class specifies the permissions for the owner group for this file
 - Functions as a mask (maximum permission)
 - Additional named users and named groups may be associated with the file
 - Each with a 3-bit permission field



26

Examples

```
[root@linux ~]# setfacl -m u:bob:rwx test
[root@linux ~]# getfacl test
 file: test
  owner: root
 group: root
user::rwx
user:bob:rwx
group::r--
                                     Step 1
mask::rwx
other::r--
```

```
[root@linux ~]# setfacl -m g:cs:rx test
[root@linux ~]# getfacl test
 file: test
 owner: root
 group: root
user::rwx
user:bob:rwx
group::r--
group:cs:r-x
mask::rwx
                                     Step 2
other::r--
```


```
[root@linux ~]# setfacl -m m:r test
[root@linux ~]# getfacl test
# file: test
 owner: root
# group: root
user::rwx
user:bob:rwx
                   effective: ?
group::r--
                   effective: ?
group:cs:r-x
                                    Step 3
mask::r--
other::r--
```

Role-based Access Control (RBAC)

 Based on the roles that users assume, instead of their identities

Widespread commercial use and an area of active research

- Many-to-many relationship
 - □ users to roles
 - □ roles to resources



 R_1

 R_2

 R_n

Access Control Matrix for RBAC

- RBAC: obeys principle of "least privilege"
 - Each role contains the minimum set of access rights needed for that role
 - A user is assigned to a role that enables him or her to perform only what is required for that role

 F_1 F_1

OBJECTS

 P_2

| | R ₁ | control | owner | owner control | read * | read owner | wakeup | wakeup | seek | owner |
|--------|----------------|---------|---------|------------------|---------|---------------|--------|--------|-------|--------|
| BOI ES | R_2 | | control | | write * | execute | | | owner | seek * |
| ROLES | • | | | | | | | | | |
| | R_{n} | | | control | | write | stop | | | |

| | R ₁ | R_2 | • • • | R_n |
|----------------|----------------|-------|-------|-------|
| U ₁ | X | | | |
| U ₂ | X | | | |
| U ₃ | | X | | X |
| U ₄ | | | | X |
| U ₅ | | | | X |
| U ₆ | | | | X |
| • | | | | |
| U _m | X | | | |

RBAC Reference Models

 A family of reference models have been defined as the basis for ongoing standardization efforts [SAND96]


Four models

■ RBAC₀: minimum functionality

■ RBAC₁: RBAC₀ + role hierarchies


 \square RBAC₂: RBAC₀ + constrains

 \square RBAC₃: RBAC₀ + RBAC1 + RBAC2



RBAC₀: Base Model

- <u>User</u>: an individual that has access to this computer system
 - ☐ Has an associated user ID
- Role: a named job function (authority level)
- <u>Permission</u>: an approval of a particular mode of access to one or more objects
- <u>Session</u>: a mapping between a user and set of roles to which a user is assigned




RBAC₁: Role Hierarchies

Roles with greater responsibility

☐ Greater authority to access resources

 A subordinate job function may have a subset of the access rights of the superior job function



RBAC₂: Constraints

 Adapting RBAC to the specifics of administrative and security policies in an organization

■ Mutually exclusive roles

- A user can be assigned to only one role in the set (either during a session or statically)
- Any permission (access right) can be granted to only one role in the set
- Non-overlapping permissions, if two users are assigned to different roles in the set

□ Cardinality

- Setting a maximum number of users w.r.t. roles
- e.g., a project leader role or a department head role might be limited to a single user

□ Prerequisite role

- A user can only be assigned to a particular role if it is already assigned to some other specified role
- e.g., a user can be assigned to a senior (higher) role only if it is already assigned an immediately junior (lower) role

Attribute-based Access Control (ABAC)

- Define authorizations that express conditions on properties of both the resource and the subject
 - e.g., Alice (subject attr.) can access the HR database (resource attr.) during week days (environment attr.)
- Strength: flexibility and expressive power
- Drawback: the performance impact of evaluating predicates on both resource and user properties for each access
 - However, increased performance cost is less noticeable for Web services and cloud computing

ABAC Model: Attributes

- Subject attributes
 - A subject is an active entity that causes information to flow among objects or changes the system state
 - Attributes define the identity and characteristics of the subject
 - e.g., name, organization, job title
- Object attributes
 - An object (or resource) is a passive system-related entity containing or receiving information
 - □ Objects have attributes that can be leveraged to make access control decisions
 - e.g., file name, file size, creator

ABAC Model: Attributes (Cont.)

- Environment attributes
 - ☐ The operational, technical, and even situational environment or context in which the information access occurs
 - e.g., current date, time, network type, etc.
 - ☐ These attributes have so far been largely ignored in most access control policies


ABAC Model: Distinguishable

- Controls access to objects by evaluating rules against the attributes of entities (subject and object), operations, and the environment
 - ☐ Attributes may be considered characteristics of anything that may be defined
- Capable of enforcing DAC, RMAC, and MAC concepts
- Fine-grained access control: allows an unlimited number of attributes to be combined to satisfy any access control rule


ABAC Logical Architecture


Four independent sources of information used for the access control decision

It is very powerful and flexible, but the cost is larger than that of other access control approaches



ACL Trust Chain





ABAC Policies

- A policy is a set of rules and relationships that govern allowable behavior within an organization
 - Based on (1) privileges of subjects; (2) how resources or objects are to be protected; (3) under which environment conditions
- An ABAC policy model [YUAN05]

```
Subject attributes ATTR(s): SA_1 \times SA_2 \times \cdots \times SA_K
```

Object attributes $ATTR(o): OA_1 \times OA_2 \times \cdots \times OA_M$

Environment attributes $ATTR(e): EA_1 \times EA_2 \times \cdots \times EA_N$

Rule $can_access(s, o, e) \leftarrow f(ATTR(s), ATTR(o), ATTR(e))$

e.g., an online movie website (user u, movie m, environment e) $can_access(u, m, e) \leftarrow (MembershipType(u) = Premium) \mid$ (MembershipType(u) = Regular & MovieType(m) = OldRelease & Time(e) = 9am - 9pm)

Case Study: RABC System for a Bank

- Dresdner bank uses a variety of computer applications over servers and mainframe computers
- In 1990, a simple DAC system was used
- For each server and mainframe computer, administrators maintained a local access control file on each host
 - □ Defining access rights for each employee on each application installed on the host
- However, it was cumbersome, time-consuming, and error-prone

How to solve it?

Case Study: RABC System for a Bank (Cont.)

- Dresdner bank then introduced an RBAC scheme
- The determination of access rights is compartmentalized into three different administrative units
 - Roles: a combination of official position and job function
 - Difference from NIST: a role is defined by a job function

| Role | Function | Official Position |
|------------------|------------------------|-------------------|
| А | financial analyst | Clerk |
| В | financial analyst | Group Manager |
| С | financial analyst | Head of Division |
| D | financial analyst | Junior |
| E | financial analyst | Senior |
| F | financial analyst | Specialist |
| G | financial analyst | Assistant |
| ••• | ••• | ••• |
| Х | share technician | Clerk |
| Υ | support e- commerce | Junior |
| Z office banking | | Head of Division |

Case Study: Functions and Roles for Banking

Role A: Financial analyst/Clerk


Role B: Financial analyst/Group manager

Permission Assignments

| Role | Application | Access Right |
|------|------------------------------|---------------------------|
| | money market instruments | 1, 2, 3, 4 |
| А | derivatives trading | 1, 2, 3, 7, 10, 12 |
| | interest instruments | 1, 4, 8, 12, 14, 16 |
| | money market instruments | 1, 2, 3, 4, 7 |
| В | derivatives trading | 1, 2, 3, 7, 10, 12, 14 |
| D | interest instruments | 1, 4, 8, 12, 14, 16 |
| | private consumer instruments | 1, 2, 4, 7 |
| ••• | ••• | ••• |

Permission Assignments with Inheritance

| Role | Application | Access Right |
|------|------------------------------|------------------------|
| | money market instruments | 1, 2, 3, 4 |
| А | derivatives trading | 1, 2, 3, 7, 10, 12 |
| | interest instruments | 1, 4, 8, 12, 14, 16 |
| | money market instruments | 7 |
| В | derivatives trading | 14 |
| | private consumer instruments | 1, 2, 4, 7 |
| ••• | ••• | ••• |



Questions?