

# Abstract Access Control Models for Dynamic RDF Datasets

*Irini Fundulaki*  
CWI & FORTH-ICS

*Giorgos Flouris*  
FORTH-ICS

*Vassilis Papakonstantinou*  
FORTH-ICS & University of Crete

# Controlling Access to RDF Data

- *Why RDF Data?*

- RDF is the de-facto standard for publishing data in the Linked Open Data Cloud
  - Public Government Data (US, UK, France, Austria, The Netherlands, ... )
  - E-Science (astronomy, life sciences, earth sciences)
  - Social Networks
  - DBpedia, Wikipedia, CIA World FactBook, ...

- *Why Access Control?*

- Crucial for *sensitive* content since it ensures the *selective exposure* of information to different classes of users

# Controlling Access to RDF Data

- *Fine-grained Access Control Model for RDF*
  - focus at the *RDF triple* level
  - focus on *read-only permissions*
  - with support for **RDFS inference** to *infer new knowledge*
  - encodes *how* an access label has been computed
    - contributing triples
- Implementation of a *fine-grained, access control framework* on top of *the MonetDB* column store engine

# Access Control Annotations

- Standard access control models associate *a concrete access label* to a triple

<i>s</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>o</i>	<i>permission</i>
<i>&amp;a</i>	<i>type</i>	<i>Student</i>	<i>allowed</i>
<i>Student</i>	<i>sc</i>	<i>Person</i>	<i>denied</i>

- An implied RDF triple can be accessed if and only if all its implying triples can be accessed

<i>s</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>o</i>	<i>permission</i>
<i>&amp;a</i>	<i>type</i>	<i>Person</i>	<i>denied</i>

# Access Control Annotations

- In the case of *any kind of update*, the implied triples & their labels must be re-computed

<i>s</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>o</i>	<i>permission</i>
&a	type	Student	allowed
Student	sc	Person	allowed ←

- An implied RDF triple can be accessed if and only if all its implying triples can be accessed

<i>s</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>o</i>	<i>permission</i>
&a	type	Person	allowed

*the overhead can be substantial when updates occur frequently*

# Access Control Annotations

- *Annotation models are easy to handle but are not amenable to changes since there is no knowledge of the affected triples*
- *Any change leads to the re-computation of inferred triples and their labels*
  - if the access label of one triple changes
  - if a triple is deleted, modified or added
  - if the semantics according to which the labels of inferred triples are computed change
  - if the policy changes (a liberal policy becomes conservative)

# Abstract Access Control Models for RDF

- Encode *how the label of an implied triple was computed*
- Triples are assigned *abstract tokens* and *not concrete values*

<i>s</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>o</i>	<i>permission</i>
<i>&amp;a</i>	<i>type</i>	<i>Student</i>	$\mathcal{L}_1$
<i>Student</i>	<i>sc</i>	<i>Person</i>	$\mathcal{L}_2$

<i>s</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>o</i>	<i>permission</i>
<i>&amp;a</i>	<i>type</i>	<i>Person</i>	$\mathcal{L}_1 \odot \mathcal{L}_2$

- $\mathcal{L}_1 \mathcal{L}_2$ : abstract tokens
- $\odot$ : operator that encodes that inference was used to produce the inferred triple

# Annotation: Computing the Access Labels

- Triples are assigned labels through *authorization queries*
- RDFS *inference rules* are applied to infer new knowledge

---

$A_1$ : (construct  $\{?x \text{ firstName } ?y\}$   
where  $\{?x \text{ type Student }\}$ , *l1*)

---

$A_2$ : (construct  $\{?x \text{ sc } ?y\}$ , *l2*)

---

$A_3$ : (construct  $\{?x \text{ type Student }\}$ , *l3*)

---

Authorizations  
(Query, *abstract token*)

	<i>s</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>o</i>	<i>l</i>
$q_1$ :	<i>Student</i>	sc	<i>Person</i>	<i>l2</i>
$q_2$ :	<i>Person</i>	sc	<i>Agent</i>	<i>l2</i>
$q_3$ :	&a	type	<i>Student</i>	<i>l3</i>
$q_4$ :	&a	<i>firstName</i>	<i>Alice</i>	<i>l1</i>
$q_5$ :	<i>Agent</i>	type	class	<i>l4</i>
$q_6$ :	<i>Student</i>	sc	<i>Person</i>	<i>l5</i>

RDF quadruples



# Annotation: Applying RDFS Inference Rules

## RDFS Inference: quadruple generating rules

$$(A_1, sc, A_2, \mathcal{I}_1) \quad (A_2, sc, A_3, \mathcal{I}_2) \quad \longrightarrow \quad (A_1, sc, A_3, \mathcal{I}_1 \odot \mathcal{I}_2)$$

$$(\&r_1, type, A_1, \mathcal{I}_1) \quad (A_1, sc, A_2, \mathcal{I}_2) \quad \longrightarrow \quad (\&r_1, type, A_2, \mathcal{I}_1 \odot \mathcal{I}_2)$$

	<i>s</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>o</i>	<i>l</i>
$q_1$ :	Student	sc	Person	$l_2$
$q_2$ :	Person	sc	Agent	$l_2$
$q_3$ :	&a	type	Student	$l_3$
$q_6$ :	Student	sc	Person	$l_5$

*RDF quadruples*

	<i>s</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>o</i>	<i>l</i>
$q_8$ :	Student	sc	Agent	$l_2 \odot l_2$
$q_9$ :	Student	sc	Agent	$l_5 \odot l_2$
$q_{10}$ :	&a	type	Person	$l_3 \odot l_2$
$q_{11}$ :	&a	type	Agent	$(l_3 \odot l_2) \odot l_2$
$q_{12}$ :	&a	type	Agent	$(l_5 \odot l_2) \odot l_2$

*Inferred RDF quadruples*

# Evaluation: Assign Concrete Values to Abstract Expressions

- *Set of Concrete Tokens* and a *Mapping* from *abstract* to *concrete* tokens
- *Set of Concrete operators* that implement the abstract ones
- *Conflict resolution operator* to resolve ambiguous labels
- *Access Function* to decide when a triple is accessible

# Abstract Access Control Models for RDF

- Use of *concrete policies* to assign concrete values to the *abstract tokens and operators*

	<i>s</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>o</i>	<i>permission</i>
$q_{11}$ :	<i>&amp;a</i>	<i>type</i>	<i>Student</i>	<i>l3</i> <b>true</b>
$q_{12}$ :	<i>Student</i>	<i>sc</i>	<i>Person</i>	<i>l2</i> <b>false</b>

- $l3$  maps to **true** and  $l2$  maps to **false**
- $\odot$  maps to *logical conjunction*

<i>s</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>o</i>	<i>permission</i>
<i>&amp;a</i>	<i>type</i>	<i>Person</i>	<b>false</b> <b>true</b> and <b>false</b>

# Abstract Access Control Models for RDF: Updates

- If a *concrete policy* changes, we need to re-compute the expressions

	<i>s</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>o</i>	<i>permission</i>
$q_{11}$ :	<i>&amp;a</i>	<i>type</i>	<i>Student</i>	<i>l3</i> <b>false</b>
$q_{12}$ :	<i>Student</i>	<i>sc</i>	<i>Person</i>	<i>l2</i> <b>true</b>

- $l3$  maps to **false** and  $l2$  maps to **true**
- $\odot$  maps to *logical disjunction*

<i>s</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>o</i>	<i>permission</i>
<i>&amp;a</i>	<i>type</i>	<i>Person</i>	<b>true</b>

**false** or **true**

# Pros & Cons of Abstract Access Control Models

- *Pros:*

- The same application can experiment with different concrete policies over the same dataset
  - liberal vs conservative policies for different classes of users
- Different applications can experiment with different concrete policies for the same data
- In the case of updates there is no need re-compute the inferred triples

- *Cons:*

- overhead in the required storage space
  - algebraic expressions can become complex depending on the structure of the dataset

A large, thick, grey brushstroke circle that is partially open on the right side, framing the word "Questions?".

*Questions?*