Access Control in Commercial DBMSs

- Most commercial systems adopt DAC
- Current discretionary authorization models for relational DBMS are based on the System R authorization model [Griffiths and Wade76]
- It is based on ownership administration with administration delegation
The System R Authorization Model

- Objects to be protected are tables and views
- Privileges include: select, update, insert, delete, drop, index (only for tables), alter (only for tables)
- Groups are supported, whereas roles are not
- Privileges can be granted with the GRANT OPTION

The System R - Delegation

- Privilege delegation is supported through the grant option: if a privilege is granted with the grant option, the user receiving it can not only exercise the privilege, but can also grant it to other users
- A user can only grant a privilege on a given relation if he/she is the table owner or if he/she has received the privilege with grant option
Grant operation

GRANT PrivilegeList| ALL[PRIVILEGES] ON Relation | View TO UserList | PUBLIC [WITH GRANT OPTION]

• it is possible to grant privileges on both relations and views
• privileges apply to entire relations (or views)
• for the update privilege, one needs to specify the columns to which it applies

Grant operation

• The authorization catalogs keep track for each users of the privileges the user possesses and of the ones that the user can delegate
• Whenever a user $U$ executes a Grant operation, the system intersects the privileges that $U$ can delegate with the set of privileges specified in the command
• If the intersection is empty, the command is not executed
Grant operation

Bob:
- is the owner of Employee table
- He thus has: Select, Insert, Update, Delete all with the Grant privileges on table Employee

Grant operation - example

1. Bob: GRANT select, insert ON Employee TO Jim WITH GRANT OPTION;
2. Bob: GRANT select ON Employee TO Ann WITH GRANT OPTION;
3. Bob: GRANT insert ON Employee TO Ann;
4. Jim: GRANT update ON Bob.Employee TO Tim WITH GRANT OPTION;
5. Ann: GRANT select, insert ON Bob.Employee TO Tim;
Grant operation - example

• The first three GRANT commands are fully executed (Bob is the owner of the table)

• The fourth command is not executed, because Jim does not have the update privilege on the table

• The fifth command is partially executed; Ann has the select and insert but she does not have the grant option for the insert --> Tim only receives the select privilege

Revoke operation

REVOKE PrivilegeList| ALL[PRIVILEGES] ON Relation | View
FROM UserList | PUBLIC

• a user can only revoke the privileges he/she has granted; it is not possible to revoke the grant option only

• upon execution of a revoke operation, the user from whom the privileges have been revoked looses these privileges, unless (s)he has them from another user independent from the one that has executed the revoke
Revoke operation - example

- Bob: GRANT select ON Employee TO Jim WITH GRANT OPTION;
- Bob: GRANT select ON Employee TO Ann WITH GRANT OPTION;
- Jim: GRANT select ON Bob.Employee TO Tim;
- Ann: GRANT select ON Bob.Employee TO Tim;
- Jim: REVOKE select ON Bob.Employee FROM Tim;
- Tim continues to hold the select privilege on table Employee after the revoke operation, since he has independently obtained such privilege from Ann.

Revoke operation - example

- Bob: GRANT select ON Employee TO Jim WITH GRANT OPTION;

![Diagram](The grantor - The grantee)
Bob: GRANT select ON Employee TO Jim WITH GRANT OPTION;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Grantor</th>
<th>Privilege</th>
<th>Grantee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>BOB</td>
<td>P1+G</td>
<td>JIM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Revoke operation - example

- Bob: GRANT select ON Employee TO Jim WITH GRANT OPTION;
- Bob: GRANT select ON Employee TO Ann WITH GRANT OPTION;
- Jim: GRANT select ON Bob.Employee TO Tim;
- Ann: GRANT select ON Bob.Employee TO Tim;
- Jim: REVOKE select ON Bob.Employee FROM Tim;
- Tim continues to hold the select privilege on table Employee after the revoke operation, since he has independently obtained such privilege from Ann.
Revoke operation

**tabular representation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Grantor/Revoker</th>
<th>Privilege</th>
<th>Grantee/Revokee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>BOB</td>
<td>G(P1+G)</td>
<td>JIM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>BOB</td>
<td>G(P1+G)</td>
<td>ANN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>JIM</td>
<td>G(P1)</td>
<td>TIM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>ANN</td>
<td>G(P1)</td>
<td>TIM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>JIM</td>
<td>R(P1)</td>
<td>TIM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Revoke operation

**graph representation**
Revoke operations

- Recursive revocation: whenever a user revokes an authorization on a table from another user, all the authorizations that the revokee had granted because of the revoked authorization are removed.

- The revocation is iteratively applied to all the subjects that received the access authorization from the revokee.

Recursive revoke

- Let $G_1, \ldots, G_n$ be a sequence of grant operations with a single privilege on the same relations, such that $i, k = 1, \ldots, n$, if $i < k$, then $G_i$ is executed before $G_k$. Let $R_i$ be the revoke operation for the privilege granted with operation $G_i$.

- The semantics of the recursive revoke requires that the state of the authorization system after the execution of the sequence

  \[ G_1, \ldots, G_n, R_i \]

be identical to the state that one would have after the execution of the sequence

\[ G_1, \ldots, G_{i-1}, G_{i+1}, \ldots, G_n \]
Recursive revocation

• Recursive revocation in the System R takes into account the timestamps denoting when each authorization has been granted
• Variations to this approach have been proposed that do not take into account the timestamps; the reason is to avoid cascades of revoke
• In such variations, the authorizations granted by the revokee are kept as long as the revokee has other authorizations for the same privilege (even if these authorizations have a larger timestamps with respect to the timestamps of the grant operations performed by the revokee)
Recursive Revocation without timestamp

Views and content-based authorization

- Views are a mechanism commonly used to support content-based access control in RDBMS
- Content-based access authorizations should be specified in terms of predicates
- Only the tuples of a relation verifying a given predicate are considered as the protected objects of the authorization
The approach to support content-based access control in RDBMS can be summarized as follows:

- Define a view containing the predicates to select the tuples to be returned to a given subject S
- Grant S the select privilege on the view, and not on the underlying table

Example: suppose we want authorize user Ann to access only the employees whose salary is lower than 20000. Steps:

- CREATE VIEW Vemp AS
  SELECT * FROM Employee
  WHERE Salary < 20000;
- GRANT Select ON Vemp TO Ann;
Queries against views are transformed through the *view composition* in queries against base tables.

The view composition operation combines in AND the predicates specified in the query on the view with the predicates which are part of the view definition.

**Ann:**

```sql
SELECT * FROM Vemp
WHERE Job = 'Programmer';
```

**Query after view composition:**

```sql
SELECT * FROM Employee
WHERE Salary < 20000 AND
Job = 'Programmer';
```
Steps in Query Processing

- Parsing
- Catalog lookup
- Authorization checking
- View Composition
- Query optimization

Note that authorization is performed before view composition; therefore, authorization checking is against the views used in the query and not against the base tables used in these views.

Views and content-based authorization

- Views can also be useful to grant select privileges on specific columns: we only need to define a view as projection on the columns on which we want to give privileges
- Views can also be used to grant privileges on simple statistics calculated on data (such as AVG, SUM,..)
Authorizations on views

• The user creating a view is called the *view definer*
• The privileges that the view definer gets on the view depend on:
  – The view semantics, that is, its definition in terms of the base relation(s)
  – The authorizations that the definer has on the base table

• The view definer does not receive privileges corresponding to operations that cannot be executed on the view
• For example, *alter* and *index* do not apply to views
Consider the following view:

Bob: `CREATE VIEW V1 (Emp#, Total_Sal)
AS SELECT Emp#, Salary + Bonus
FROM Employee WHERE
Job = 'Programmer';`

The update operation is not defined on column Total_Sal of the view; therefore, Bob will not receive the update authorization on such column.

Basically, to determine the privileges that the view definer has on the view, the system needs to intersect the set of privileges that the view definer has on the base tables with the set of privileges corresponding to the operations that can be performed on the view.
Consider relation Employee and assume Bob is the creator of Employee.

Consider the following sequence of commands:
- Bob: GRANT Select, Insert, Update ON Employee to Tim;
- Tim: CREATE VIEW V1 AS SELECT Emp#, Salary FROM Employee;
- Tim: CREATE VIEW V2 (Emp#, Annual_Salary) AS SELECT Emp#, Salary*12 FROM Employee;

Tim can exercise on V1 all privileges he has on relation Employee, that is, Select, Insert, Update.

By contrast, Tim can exercise on V2 only the privileges of Select and Update on column Emp#.
It is possible to grant authorizations on a view: the privileges that a user can grant are those that he/she owns with grant option on the base tables.

Example: user Tim cannot grant any authorization on views V1 and V2 he has defined, because he does not have the authorizations with grant option on the base table.

Consider the following sequence of commands:

- Bob: GRANT Select ON Employee TO Tim WITH GRANT OPTION;
- Bob: GRANT Update, Insert ON Employee TO Tim;
- Tim: CREATE VIEW V4 AS SELECT Emp#, Salary FROM Employee;
- Authorizations of Tim on V4:
  - Select with Grant Option;
  - Update, Insert without Grant Option;