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Programme

Examine the XACML standard and the XACML RBAC profile

- Examine the XACML implementation of role-based access control policies
- Identify any shortcomings
- Identify any omissions
- Propose some extensions and alternative approaches
Outline of talk

- Introduction to XACML
- Introduction to RBAC
- The XACML RBAC profile
- An alternative approach to RBAC using XACML
- Assigning subjects to roles
- Separation of duty
XACML
Introduction

XACML is a dialect of XML used to specify and enforce authorization policies.

XACML 2.0 was approved as OASIS standard on 1 February 2005.

XACML is intended to provide:

- Interchangeable policy format
- Support for fine- and coarse-grained authorization policies
- Conditional authorization
- Policy combination and conflict resolution
- Independency from implementation
The XACML view of access control

- Resource
- PEP
- Subject
- Context Handler
- PIP
- Policy or PolicySet
- PAP
- PDP
XACML building blocks

PDP
- Match subject, resource, action in request
- Match condition
- Combine rules' results
- Combine policies' results
- Combine policy sets' results

XACML flow:
- <Request>
  - <Subject>
  - <Resource>
  - <Action>

PolicySet
- <Policy>
  - <Target>
    - <Subject>
    - <Resource>
    - <Action>
  - <Rule>
    - <Target>
      - <Subject>
      - <Resource>
      - <Action>
    - <Condition>

Match subject, resource, action in request
Combine rules' results
Combine policies' results
Combine policy sets' results
ANSI RBAC
Core RBAC

Diagram showing relationships between categories:
- U (Users)
- UA (User Accounts)
- R (Roles)
- PA (Permission Authorities)
- P (Permissions)
Hierarchical RBAC
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The XACML RBAC profile
Introduction

RB-XACML 2.0 approved as OASIS committee draft 30 September 2004

Implements *core* and *hierarchical* components of ANSI standard

- Roles and role hierarchies
- Permission-role assignment relation
- User-role assignment relation

Does not support separation of duty

- RB-XACML 1.0 did support separation of duty
RB-XACML policies

- Role assignment is strongly bound to role definition
- Permissions are strongly bound to roles
- Role hierarchy is defined implicitly using permission aggregation
- Extensive use is made of <PolicyIdReference> and <PolicySetIdReference> elements
A different formulation of RBAC using XACML
Introduction

Aims are to

- Obtain a closer correspondence between XACML policies and RBAC model
- Provide a more natural way of defining
  - Role hierarchies
  - Permissions
  - Permission-role assignment
- Support the idea of complex permissions
Crampton’s role-based XACML policies

- Role set explicitly defines role hierarchy
- No mechanism for associating subjects with roles
- Permissions are first-class entities
- Permission can (easily) be assigned to multiple roles
Complex permissions

Useful for hierarchically structured resources

- XML data (Crampton, SWS 2004)
- File systems
- Object-oriented applications
Assigning subjects to roles
RB-XACML view of user-role assignment

PEP → Context Handler → PDP

PIP → Context Handler → PDP

role attribute set in request context

attribute query

attribute

role assignment policy or policyset
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**Observations**

The design of the REA and role assignment policies is rather unambitious

- The REA matches subject IDs to role attributes using a Role Assignment `<PolicySet>`
- Designed for centralized systems with a known user population
  - Hardly suitable for web services!

In XACML the `<Subject>` of an access request can be defined in terms of the requester’s attributes rather than its identity

- The context handler is responsible for constructing the request and verifying the authenticity of the attributes (using PIPs)
- The PDP matches `<Target>` elements in policies and rules to attributes in the request context
**Attribute-based role assignment (1)**

Use policy that assigns subjects to roles based on requester attributes (RBTM, Author-\(\mathcal{X}\), TPL)

- Attributes define `<Subject>` element in request
- Context handler is responsible for obtaining and verifying the authenticity of the attributes

PDP matches attributes in request to role(s) using Role Assignment `<PolicySet>`

- Role is now explicitly defined by the attributes that are required to enter into the role
Attribute-based role assignment (2)

<XACML and RBAC/Assigning subjects to roles>

All purchase orders, sign

Permission Assignment <PolicySet>
<Target>
Subject has these attributes issued by these authorities

Role Assignment <PolicySet>
Manager Role Assignment <Policy>
<Target>
Subject has these attributes issued by these authorities

Role <PolicySet>
Manager Role <PolicySet>
Employee Role <PolicySet>

Permission Assignment <PolicySet>
Manager Permission <PolicySet>
Employee Permission <PolicySet>

Permission <PolicySet>
<Target>
All purchase orders, sign
<Target>
All purchase orders, create
Separation of duty using XACML
Introduction

Policy requirement: *No purchase order can be created and signed by the same user*

One common solution (ANSI RBAC) is to ensure that no user has the permission to both create and sign a purchase order

- This solution imposes a constraint on users
  - There does not exist a user that can create and sign a purchase order

- The requirement is a constraint on purchase orders
  - There does not exist a purchase order that has been created and signed by the same user
Separation of duty in RBAC

This solution is particularly unattractive in a role-based context

- The permissions to create and sign a purchase order must be assigned to different roles $r_{\text{create}}$ and $r_{\text{sign}}$
- No user can be assigned to both $r_{\text{create}}$ and $r_{\text{sign}}$
- No role can be more senior than both $r_{\text{create}}$ and $r_{\text{sign}}$

These disadvantages can be mitigated using dynamic rather than static separation of duty
Blacklists

An alternative solution is to implement user-based separation of duty at the object instance level (Crampton, SACMAT 2003)

- Inspired by history matrix concept from Chinese wall model and capability lists derived from access control matrix model
- Maintain dynamic “anti-capability-lists” or blacklists for each user
- If Jason creates purchase order $p$ then the permission $(p, sign)$ is appended to Jason’s blacklist
- Concept can be generalized to implement other forms of separation of duty
Blacklists using XACML

```xml
<PolicySet PolicySetId="blacklists" ...>
  <Target> ... anyone ... any resource ... any action ... </Target>
  <PolicyIdReference>blacklist:jason</PolicyIdReference>
  :
</PolicySet>

<Policy PolicyId="blacklist:jason" ...>
  RuleCombiningAlgorithm="deny-overrides" ... >
  <Target> ... jason ... any resource ... any action ... </Target>
  <Rule Effect="Deny" ... >
    <Target> ... purchase-order-id="123" action="sign" ... </Target>
  </Rule>
  :
</Policy>
```
XACML <Obligations>

Policy requirement: A physician may write to a medical record provided an email is sent to the patient

The (optional) <Obligations> element of an XACML <Policy> is a directive to the PEP to perform additional processing following the enforcement of an access control decision

- Contains one or more <Obligation> elements
- Typically references elements in the request context
- Processing of <Obligations> elements is application-specific
Putting it all together (1)

Basic idea is to exploit the `<Obligations>` mechanism to update blacklists

- The permission to create purchase orders must include an `<Obligation>` element
- The `<Obligation>` element requires that the PEP write a new rule to the appropriate blacklist `<Policy>`
  - If a request by Jason to create a purchase order is permitted ...
  - ... then a new `<Rule>` must be added to Jason’s blacklist
Putting it all together (2)

<PolicySet ... PolicySetId="Permission:Set" ... >
  <Policy ... PolicyId="permission:po:create" ... >
    <Rule ... >
      <Target> ... purchase orders ... create </Target>
    </Rule>
    <Obligations ... >
      <Obligation FulfillOn="Permit" ... >
        add permission (this-purchase-order,sign) to subject’s blacklist
      </Obligation>
    </Obligations>
  </Policy>
</PolicySet>
Putting it all together (3)
**Future work**

- Liaise with XACML TC
  - Explore the advantages of the alternative formulation of RBAC using XACML
  - Include separation of duty in XACML RBAC profile
- Investigate the extent to which obligations, XACML policies, and role-based administrative models can be used to manage XACML RBAC policies
- Investigate to what extent SAML and XACML can inter-operate to support
  - Attribute-based role assignment
  - Discovery of distributed credentials and credential chains