

# ARBAC Analyser Report

## Goal

The challenge requires the realization of an analyser of little ARBAC policies, in particular it must solve the role reachability problem:

### Definition

Given an initial user-to-role assignment  $UR$ , a policy  $\mathcal{P}$  and a role  $r_g$ , the **role reachability** problem amounts to checking whether there exists a user-to-role assignment  $UR'$  such that  $UR \rightarrow_{\mathcal{P}}^* UR'$  and  $r_g \in UR'(u)$  for some user  $u$ .

*Role reachability problem definition from the slides of the course security2 of Ca' Foscari University*

For the original assignment text, check [arbaclab.pdf](#).

## Pseudocode

The analyzer visit recursively all possible configuration (a configuration is a UR, represent user-to-role assignment) applying all possible rules (CA and CR) to visited configuration and check if one of the new configurations contains an assignment to the goal\_role

It keeps track of all visited configurations in order to avoid useless additional computation on already visited configurations.

```
visited_config = initial_UR
current_config = visited_configuration
while( (no one of current_config contains goal_role) and (current_config not
empty) )
    new_config = {}
    for each config in current_config
        new_config_tmp = generate all possible new configuration applying all
possible rules to the config
        for each config2 in new_config_tmp
            if (config2 not in visited_config)
                new_config = new_config + config2
                visited_config = visited_config + config2

    current_config = new_config

if (any of the current_config contains goal_role)
    return true
else
    return false
```

## Backward and forward slicing

I applied the backward and the forward slicing techniques to see the improvement of their usage on the program performance (in terms of time spent).

### Backward

```
S = {goal_role}
while (S change)
    for each rule in ca
        if r_t in S
            S = S union {r_a} union r_p union r_n

    for each rule in ca
        if r_t not in S
            remove rule from ca
    for each rule in cr
        if r_t not in S
            remove rule from cr
roles = S
```

### Forward

```
S = roles in ur
while (S change)
    for each rule in ca
        if r_t in S
            S = S union {r_a} union r_p union r_n

    for each rule in ca
        for each r_p_role in r_p
            if (r_p_role not in S)
                remove rule from ca
    for each rule in cr
        if (r_a not in S) or (r_t not in S)
            remove rule from cr
    for each rule in ca
        for each r_n_role in r_n
            if (r_n_role not in S)
                remove r_n_role from r_n

roles = S
```

## Code

---

As programming language, I used python.

In the code I used ua instead of ur to refer to the user-to-role .

### Function that creates a dict user:roles

```
# used to obtain a dict (<user>:<roles>) from ua
def build_dict_from_pairs(pairs):
    ret_dict = {}
    for pair in pairs:
        if pair[0] in ret_dict:
            ret_dict[pair[0]].append(pair[1])
        else:
            ret_dict[pair[0]] = [pair[1]]
    return ret_dict
```

**Function that, giving a configuration and a ca rule, returns the list of users on which the rule can be apply**

```
#config is ua, return list of users that can be assigned the r_t of ca
def can_apply_ca(config, ca):
    #check if ra exist
    ra_finded = False
    for ua_pair in config:
        if (ua_pair[1] == ca[0]):
            ra_finded = True
    if (not ra_finded):
        return []
    #build a user:roles dict
    ua_dict = build_dict_from_pairs(config)
    #find users which satisfy r_p and r_n
    users_satisfy = []
    for user in ua_dict:
        flag = True
        #check if user satisfy r_p
        for r_p in ca[1]:
            if (r_p not in ua_dict[user]):
                flag = False

        #check if user satisfy r_n
        for r_n in ca[2]:
            if (r_n in ua_dict[user]):
                flag = False

        #check if user already has r_t
        if (ca[-1] in ua_dict[user]):
            flag = False

        if flag:
            users_satisfy.append(user)
    return users_satisfy
```

**Function that, giving a configuration and a cr rule, returns the list of users on which the rule can be apply**

```
#config is ua, return list of users that can be revoked the r_t of cr
def can_apply_cr(config, cr):
    #check if ra exist
    ra_finded = False
    for ua_pair in config:
        if (ua_pair[1] == cr[0]):
```

```

        ra_finded = True
    if (not ra_finded):
        return []
    else:
        # for each pair <user,role>, check if role is r_t, if true, return user
        ret_users = []
        for pair in config:
            if pair[1] == cr[1]: ret_users.append(pair[0])
        return ret_users

```

## Function that, giving a list of configurations and a goal role, checks if one of them contains the goal role

I test a list of configurations rather than a single configuration because I'll use this function to test all the configurations generated during an iteration (I'll call this function into the while condition).

```

def reached_goal_multiple(configurations, goal_role):
    for config in configurations:
        for user_role in config:
            if (user_role[1] == goal_role): return True
    return False

```

## Parse policy from input

```

import sys

roles = []
users = []
ua = []
cr = []
ca = []
goal = ""

for line in sys.stdin:
    if (line[0:5] == "Roles"):
        roles = line.split(" ")[1:-1]
    elif (line[0:5] == "Users"):
        users = line.split(" ")[1:-1]
    elif (line[0:2] == "UA"):
        for ua_pair in line.split(" ")[1:-1]:
            ua.append([ua_pair.split(",")[0][1:], ua_pair.split(",")[1][:-1]])
    elif (line[0:2] == "CR"):
        for cr_pair in line.split(" ")[1:-1]:
            cr.append([cr_pair.split(",")[0][1:], cr_pair.split(",")[1][:-1]])
    elif (line[0:2] == "CA"):
        for ca_tuple in line.split(" ")[1:-1]:
            splitted_tuple = ca_tuple.split(",")
            r_a = splitted_tuple[0][1:]
            r_t = splitted_tuple[2][:-1]
            r_p = []
            r_n = []
            if (splitted_tuple[1] != "TRUE"):
                for r in splitted_tuple[1].split("&"):
                    if (r[0] == "-"):
                        r_n.append(r[1:])
                    else:

```

```

        r_p.append(r)
        ca.append([r_a, r_p, r_n, r_t])
    elif(line[0:4] == "Goal"):
        goal = line.split(" ")[1]

```

## Apply backward slicing

```

#apply backward slicing
backward_states = [goal] #initialize S_0

flag = True
while(flag):
    new_backward_states = backward_states
    for ca_tuple in ca:
        #check if the roles r_t of the ca is in backward_states (S_i-1)
        if (ca_tuple[-1] in backward_states):
            new_backward_states = list(set(new_backward_states) | {ca_tuple[0]}
| set(ca_tuple[1]) | set(ca_tuple[2]))
            if (new_backward_states != backward_states):
                backward_states = new_backward_states
        else:
            flag = False

#remove from ca rules that assign a role in R\S*
ca_new = []
for ca_tuple in ca:
    if ca_tuple[-1] in backward_states:
        ca_new.append(ca_tuple)
ca = ca_new

#remove from cr rules cr_tuple that revoke a role in R\S*
cr_new = []
for cr_tuple in cr:
    if cr_tuple[-1] in backward_states:
        cr_new.append(cr_tuple)
cr = cr_new

roles = backward_states

```

## Apply forward slicing

```

#apply forward slicing

#initialize S_0
forward_states = []
for ua_pair in ua:
    forward_states.append(ua_pair[1])

forward_states = list(set(forward_states))

flag = True
while(flag):
    new_forward_states = forward_states
    for ca_tuple in ca:
        #check if the roles in r_p and r_a of the ca are in forward_states (S_i-1)

```

```

        inclusion_satisfied = True
        for role in ( [ca_tuple[0]] + ca_tuple[1] ):
            if not(role in forward_states):
                inclusion_satisfied = False
        if (inclusion_satisfied):
            new_forward_states = list(set(new_forward_states) | {ca_tuple[-1]})
        if (set(new_forward_states) != set(forward_states)):
            forward_states = new_forward_states
        else:
            flag = False

#remove from ca rules that include in r_p a role in R\S*
ca_new = []
for ca_tuple in ca:
    flag = True
    for rp_role in ca_tuple[1]:
        if not (rp_role in forward_states):
            flag = False
    if flag:
        ca_new.append(ca_tuple)
ca = ca_new

#remove from cr rules that mention a role in R\S*
cr_new = []
for cr_tuple in cr:
    if cr_tuple[0] in forward_states and cr_tuple[1] in forward_states:
        cr_new.append(cr_tuple)
cr = cr_new

#remove the role R\S* from the negative preconditions of all rule
for ca_tuple in ca:
    rn_new = []
    for rn_role in ca_tuple[2]:
        if rn_role in forward_states:
            rn_new.append(rn_role)
    ca_tuple[2] = rn_new

roles = forward_states

```

## Check all possible configurations applying all rules to each config

I use a timeout to limit the execution time in case of negative instances, it is a naive solution since the program will not be stopped exactly 10 seconds after the timeout is setup.

```

import time

visited_configurations = []
visited_configurations.append(set(tuple(item) for item in ua))
current_configurations = []
current_configurations.append(ua)

timeout = time.time()+10
start_time = time.time()
while (not reached_goal_multiple(current_configurations,goal) and
current_configurations and time.time() < timeout):
    new_current_configurations = []
    for config in current_configurations:

```

```

        #for each configuration apply all possible ca
        for ca_to_apply in ca:
            users_to_apply = can_apply_ca(config, ca_to_apply)
            #for each ca apply it to all possible user
            for user in users_to_apply:
                #for each user apply ca adding the new role
                new_config = config.copy()
                new_config.append([user, ca_to_apply[-1]])
                #if the configuration is new, add it to the configuration to
visit
                if set(tuple(item) for item in new_config) not in
visited_configurations:
                    new_current_configurations.append(new_config)
                    visited_configurations.append(set(tuple(item) for item in
new_config))

            for cr_to_apply in cr:
                users_to_apply = can_apply_cr(config, cr_to_apply)
                #for each cr apply it to all possible user
                for user in users_to_apply:
                    #for each user apply cr removing the role
                    new_config = config.copy()
                    new_config.remove([user, cr_to_apply[-1]])
                    #if the configuration is new, add it to the configuration to
visit
                    if set(tuple(item) for item in new_config) not in
visited_configurations:
                        new_current_configurations.append(new_config)
                        visited_configurations.append(set(tuple(item) for item in
new_config))
                current_configurations = new_current_configurations

print(time.time()-start_time)
print(reached_goal_multiple(current_configurations, goal))

```

## Results

I ran the program (without slicing) on the first policy (returning true and terminating without visiting all possible configs), I noticed that the execution time was too great: 781 sec. Using forward slicing I obtained slight (and not satisfying) improvements: 736 sec. With backward slicing the situation totally changes, with an execution time of 0.3 sec. The results obtained using other two policies (policy3 and policy4) are similar:

| Policy  | Without slicing | Forward slicing | Backward slicing | Backward and Forward |
|---------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|----------------------|
| Policy1 | 781.3073        | 736.3435        | 0.2361           | 0.2646               |
| Policy3 | 0.6556          | 0.4759          | 0.0028           | 0.0023               |
| Policy4 | 871.9254        | 722             | 7.0803           | 5.0134               |

*execution time (in seconds) of the program on different policies using or not slicing*

So i decided to use backward slicing to complete the task and I test other policies obtaining the flag: 10110110.

I tried to use backward and forward slicing together and as you can notice, there is not a great improvement and, considering the time spent to perform the additional slicing, for little policies

we can be satisfied using only the backward slicing.