## Outline for April 6, 2000

- 1. Greetings and felicitations!
  - a. Handouts
- 2. ACM and primitive operations
  - a. Go over subjects, objects (includes subjects), and state (S, O, A) where A is ACM
  - b. Transitions modify ACM entries; primitive operations follow
  - c. enter r into A[s,o]
  - d. **delete** r **from** A[s,o]
  - e. **create subject** s' (note  $A[s',x] = A[x,s'] = \emptyset$  for all x)
  - f. **create object**  $o'(\text{note } A[x,o'] = \emptyset \text{ for all } x)$
  - g. destroy subject s'
  - h. destroy object o'
- 3. commands

```
a.
         command c(s_1, ..., s_k, o_1, ..., o_k)
         if
             r_1 in A[s_1, o_1] and
              r_2 in A[s_2, o_2] and
              r_m in A[s_m, o_m]
         then
              op_1;
              op<sub>2</sub>;
              ...;
              op_n;
         end.
b. Example 1: creating a file
    command create_file(p, f)
         create object f;
         enter Own into A[p, f]
         enter Read into A[p, f]
```

enter Write into A[p, f]

```
end.
```

```
c. Example 2:granting one process read rights to a file command grant_read(p, q, f) if Own in A[p, f] then enter Read into A[q, f]
```

end.

- 4. What is the safety question?
  - a. An unauthorized state is one in which a generic right r could be leaked into an entry in the ACM that did not previously contain r. An initial state is safe for r if it cannot lead to a state in which r could be leaked.
  - b. Question: in a given arbitrary protection system, is safety decidable?
- 5. Mono-operational protection systems: decidable
  - a. Theorem: there is an algorithm that decides whether a given mono-operational system and initial state is safe for a given generic right.
  - b. Proof: finite number of command sequences; can eliminate delete, destroy.
    Ignore more than one create as all others are conditioned on access rights in the matrix. (One exception: no subjects; then we need one create subject).
    Bound: *s* number of subjects (possibly one more than in original), *o* number of objects (same), *g* number of

Bound: *s* number of subjects (possibly one more than in original), *o* number of objects (same), *g* number of generic rights; number of command sequences to inspect is at most  $2^{gso}$ .

- 6. General case: It is undecidable whether a given state of a given protection system is safe for a given generic right.
  - a. Represent TM as ACM; reduce halting problem to it

- 7. Take-Grant
  - a. Introduce as counterpoint to NRU result
  - b. Show bridges (as a combination of terminal and initial spans)
  - c. Show islands (maximal subject-only tg-connected subgraphs)
  - d. can•share(r,  $\mathbf{x}$ ,  $\mathbf{y}$ ,  $\mathbf{G}_0$ ) iff there is an edge from  $\mathbf{x}$  to  $\mathbf{y}$  labelled r in  $\mathbf{G}_0$ , or all of the following hold: (1) there is a vertex  $\mathbf{y}$ '' with an edge from  $\mathbf{y}$ ' to  $\mathbf{y}$  labelled r; (2) there is a subject  $\mathbf{y}$ ' which terminally spans to  $\mathbf{y}$ '', or  $\mathbf{y}' = \mathbf{y}''$ ; (3) there is a subject  $\mathbf{x}$ ' which initially spans to  $\mathbf{x}$ , or  $\mathbf{x}' = \mathbf{x}$ ; and (4) there is a sequence of islands  $I_1, ..., I_n$  connected by bridges for which  $\mathbf{x}$ ' is in  $I_1$  and  $\mathbf{y}$ ' is in  $I_n$ .
  - e. Describe can•steal; don't state theorem