4.3. MAC

MAC specifies the access that subjects have to access objects based on subjects and objects classification.
 A subjects has access to the object for which it has a clearance.

- This type of security has also been referred to as MultiLevel Security (MLS)
- Database systems that satisfy multilevel security properties are called multilevel secure database management systems (MLS/DBMSs)
- Many of the MLS/DBMSs have been designed based on the Bell-LaPadula (BLP) model.

Mandatory access control

- Entities are assigned security levels
- Subject has security clearance $L(s) = I_s$
- Object has security classification $L(o) = I_o$
- Simplest case: Security levels are arranged in a linear order $I_i < I_{i+1}$

Example

Top secret > Secret > Confidential > Unclassified



Tamara and Thomas are cleared into (are in or have clearance at) the security level Top Secret.
Electronic Mail Files are in the security level Secret.

The goal of the Bell-LaPadula security model is to prevent read access to objects at a security classification higher than the subject's clearance

Examples

- Claire can read Activity Log Files and Phone List Files, but can't read Personal Files and Mail Files.
- Bell-LaPadula combines 2 MAC rules and one DAC rule with three security properties:
 - The Simple Security Property,
 - The *-property, and
 - The the Discretionary Security Property

Simple security property, preliminary version:

- s can read o if and only if
 - $I_o \leq I_s$ and
 - s has read access to o
- Combines mandatory *(security levels)* and discretionary *(permission required)*
- Prevents subjects from reading objects at higher levels (*No Read Up rule*)
- Examples:
 - Ursula can read only phone list file

Information is allowed to flow up, not down

*-property , preliminary version:

- s can write o if and only if
 - $I_s \leq I_o$ and
 - s has write access to o
- Combines mandatory *(security levels)* and discretionary *(permission required)*
- Prevents subjects from writing to objects at lower levels (*No Write Down rule*)
- Examples:
 - Ursula can write any where but Clear can't write in the Phone List Files

Information is allowed to flow up, not down

Basic Security Theorem: Let Σ be a system with secure initial state σ_0 , and let T be a set of state transformations. If every element of T preserves the simple security condition, preliminary version, and the *-Property, preliminary version, then every state σ_i , $i \ge 0$, is secure.

Bell LaPadula: Expanded

Total order of classifications not flexible enough

 Alice cleared for missiles; Bob cleared for warheads; Both cleared for targets

Solution: Categories

- Use set of compartments
- Enforce "need to know" principle
- Security levels (level, category set)
 (Top Secret, {Nuc, Eur, Asi})
 (Top Secret, {Nuc, Asi})
- Dominates relation
 - (*L*,*C*) *dominates,* or *Dom*, (*L'*,*C'*) \Leftrightarrow *L'* \leq *L* and *C'* \subseteq *C*
 - Induces lattice of security levels

Bell LaPadula: Expanded

Dominate relation

- George is cleared into security level (Secret, {NUC,EUR}),
- DocA is classified as (Confidential, {NUC})
- DocB is classified as (Secret, {EUR, US})
- DocC is classified as (Secret, {EUR})

Then

- George Dom DocA
- George *Dom* DocB
- George *Dom* DocC

Bell LaPadula: Expanded Lattice of categories

Examples of levels:

- (Top Secret, {Nuc,Asi}) dom (Secret, {Nuc})?
- (Secret, {Nuc, Eur}) dom (Confidential, {Nuc,Eur})?
- (Top Secret, {Nuc}) dom (Confidential, {Eur}) ?



Bell LaPadula: Expanded:

Simple Security Condition: S can read O if and only if
 Clearance of S dominates classification of O and
 S has read access to O

*-Property: S can write O if and only if

- Classification of O dominates clearance of S and
- S has write access to O

Basic Security Theorem: Let Σ be a system with secure initial state $\sigma_{0^{\prime}}$ and let T be a set of state transformations. If every element of T preserves the simple security condition and the *-Property, then every state σ_{i} , $i \ge 0$, is secure.

4.4. RBAC

- One challenging problem in managing large systems is the complexity of security administration.
- End users often do not own the information for which they are allowed access. The corporation or agency is the actual owner of data objects.
- Control is often based on <u>employee functions</u> rather than data ownership.
- RBAC has been proposed as an *alternative* approach to DAC and MAC, both to
 - Simplify the task of access control management,
 - Directly support function-based access control.

RBAC

- Roles represent functions within a given organization and authorizations are granted to roles instead of to single users
- Users are thus simply authorized to "play" the appropriate roles, thereby acquiring the roles' authorizations

RBAC: Benefits

- Because roles represent organizational functions, an RBAC model can directly support security policies of the organization
- Granting and revoking of user authorizations is greatly simplified
- Most commercial DBMSs support RBAC features at some extents
 31





Users change frequently, roles don't

RBAC: SQL Commands

- CREATE ROLE role-name IDENTIFIED BY passwd |NOT IDENTIFIED;
- Example:
 - CREATE ROLE teller IDENTIFIED BY cashflow;
- DROP ROLE role-name;
- GRANT role TO user | role | PUBLIC
 [WITH ADMIN OPTION];
- To perform the grant of a role, a user must have the privilege for the role with the ADMIN option, or the system privilege GRANT ANY ROLE
 - The ADMIN option allows the receiver to modify or drop the role

RBAC: SQL Commands

■ Example:

- GRANT teller TO Bob WITH ADMIN OPTION;

The grant command for authorization granting can have roles as subjects

Example:

- GRANT select ON Employee TO teller;

5. Conclusion

Database security Based on Access Controls

4 access control models

- DAC
- CBAC
- MAC
- RBAC

