

Tracing *where* and *who* provenance in linked data - a calculus -

<http://id.ecs.soton.ac.uk/person/9724>

with M. Dezani-Ciancaglini and R. Horne

Tracing *where* and *who* provenance in linked data - a calculus -

<http://id.ecs.soton.ac.uk/person/9724>



Vladimiro Sassone

with M. Dezani-Ciancaglini and R. Horne

A six-slides talk featuring:

- an operational model of linked data processes that produce, consume, publish and query linked data;
- a model of *where* and *who* (and perhaps *why*) provenance for linked data;
- a *logic* for provenance patterns to specify *queries* over linked data
- a typing system to enforce *access control* policies based on provenance patterns and local policies.

Or: why do I think we should be using more of them

Or: why do I think we should be using more of them

Short answer: cause they are very good

Or: why do I think we should be using more of them

Short answer: cause they are very good

Longer answer: cause they are very, very good

Or: why do I think we should be using more of them

Short answer: cause they are very good

Longer answer: cause they are very, very good

They are at the same time *syntax* and *semantics*:
provide unambiguous, compositional semantics and
abstract/logical/(co)inductive reasoning techniques;

yet, they are executable, behavioural, easy to handle,
compact, essential, and come with algebraic and type
theories which support simple syntactic proofs, possibly
formalisable in automated theorem provers.

Provenance & Patterns

agents: $\alpha, \beta \dots$; locations: ℓ, m, \dots ; functions: f, g, \dots

Provenance & Patterns

agents: $\alpha, \beta \dots$; locations: ℓ, m, \dots ; functions: f, g, \dots

patterns: *agents* $\sigma ::= \alpha \mid _$ *locations* $\Lambda ::= \ell \mid a \mid _$

function tags $\phi ::= f \mid _$

Provenance & Patterns

agents: $\alpha, \beta \dots$; locations: ℓ, m, \dots ; functions: f, g, \dots

patterns: *agents* $\sigma ::= \alpha \mid _$ *locations* $\Lambda ::= \ell \mid a \mid _$

function tags $\phi ::= f \mid _$

provenances:

$p ::=$	ϵ	empty
	(α, ℓ)	who-where
	$f\#$	why
	$p \cdot p$	concatenation
	$p \vee p$	disjunction

agents: $\alpha, \beta \dots$; locations: ℓ, m, \dots ; functions: f, g, \dots

patterns: *agents* $\sigma ::= \alpha \mid _$ *locations* $\Lambda ::= \ell \mid a \mid _$

function tags $\phi ::= f \mid _$

provenances:

$p ::=$	ϵ	empty
	(α, ℓ)	who-where
	$f\#$	why
	$p \cdot p$	concatenation
	$p \vee p$	disjunction

$(Goble, \ell_1) \cdot (Buneman, \ell_2) \cdot f\# \cdot ((Moreau, \ell_1) \vee (Groth, \ell_0))$

agents: $\alpha, \beta \dots$; locations: ℓ, m, \dots ; functions: f, g, \dots

patterns: *agents* $\sigma ::= \alpha \mid _$ *locations* $\Lambda ::= \ell \mid a \mid _$

function tags $\phi ::= f \mid _$

provenances:

$p ::=$	ϵ	empty
	(α, ℓ)	who-where
	$f\#$	why
	$p \cdot p$	concatenation
	$p \vee p$	disjunction

patterns:

$\pi ::=$	ϵ	empty
	(σ, Λ)	who-where
	$\phi\#$	why
	$\pi \cdot \pi$	concatenation
	$\pi \vee \pi$	disjunction
	$^*\pi$	Kleene star
	\top	top

$(Goble, \ell_1) \cdot (Buneman, \ell_2) \cdot f\# \cdot ((Moreau, \ell_1) \vee (Groth, \ell_0))$

Provenance & Patterns

agents: $\alpha, \beta \dots$; locations: ℓ, m, \dots ; functions: f, g, \dots

patterns: *agents* $\sigma ::= \alpha \mid _$ *locations* $\Lambda ::= \ell \mid a \mid _$

function tags $\phi ::= f \mid _$ *patterns*

- $*[(\alpha, _) \vee (\beta, _)]$ only α and β ever wrote it.
- $\top(_, \ell)$ the data originated in ℓ , with $\top = *(_)$
- $\top(\beta, _)(\alpha, \ell) \top$ data in ℓ by α in was reposted by β .
- $\neg(\top(\alpha, _) \top)$ α never wrote the data anywhere.

\mid $p \vee p$ disjunction

\mid \top

top

$(Goble, \ell_1) \cdot (Buneman, \ell_2) \cdot f\# \cdot ((Moreau, \ell_1) \vee (Groth, \ell_0))$

Data, Expressions & Queries

stored data:

$D ::=$	$(\ell \ell \ell)^p$	tracked triple
	$D \parallel D$	composition
	0	empty data

expressions:

$e ::=$	x	variable
	D	data
	$f(e)$	application
	$e \parallel e$	composition

stored data:

$D ::=$	$(\ell \ell \ell)^p$	tracked triple
	$D \parallel D$	composition
	0	empty data

expressions:

$e ::=$	x	variable
	D	data
	$f(e)$	application
	$e \parallel e$	composition

queries:

$Q ::=$	$(\lambda \lambda \lambda)^\pi$	triple pattern
	$Q \oplus Q$	choose
	$Q \otimes Q$	tensor
	$\exists a.Q$	exists
	$*Q$	iteration

Data, Expressions & Queries

stored data:

$D ::=$ $(\ell \ell \ell)^p$ tracked triple
 $| D \parallel D$ composition
 $| 0$ empty data

expressions:

$e ::=$ x variable
 $| D$ data
 $| f(e)$ application
 $| e \parallel e$ composition

queries:

$$\frac{p \Vdash \pi}{C^p \models C^\pi}$$

$$\frac{D \models Q\{\ell/a\}}{D \models \exists a.Q}$$

$$\frac{D \models Q_0}{D \models Q_0 \oplus Q_1}$$

$$\frac{D_0 \models Q_0 \quad D_1 \models Q_1}{D_0 \parallel D_1 \models Q_0 \otimes Q_1}$$

$| Q \otimes Q$ tensor
 $| \exists a.Q$ exists
 $| *Q$ iteration

Data, Expressions & Queries

stored data:

$D ::= (\ell \ell \ell)^p$ tracked triple
 $| D \parallel D$ composition
 $| 0$ empty data

expressions:

$e ::= x$ variable
 $| D$ data
 $| f(e)$ application
 $| e \parallel e$ composition

$$\frac{p \Vdash \pi}{C^p \models C^\pi}$$

$$\frac{D \models Q\{\ell/a\}}{D \models \exists a.Q}$$

$$\frac{D \models Q_0}{D \models Q_0 \oplus Q_1} \quad \frac{D_0 \models Q_0 \quad D_1 \models Q_1}{D_0 \parallel D_1 \models Q_0 \otimes Q_1}$$

$Q \otimes Q$ tensor

$\exists a. \exists b. (a \ p \ b)^{(_, \ell) \cdot \top}$ exists iteration

$\exists a. \exists b. (a \ p \ b)^{(\alpha, m) \cdot (_, \ell) \cdot \top}$

processes:

$P ::=$	0	termination
	$\text{get}(Q, x).P$	consume
	$\text{del}(Q, x).P$	delete
	$\text{ins}(\lambda, e).P$	publish
	$P + P$	choose
	X	process variable
	$\text{rec}X.P$	recursion
	$\exists a : \text{Loc}(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{I}).P$	select location

Processes & Behaviours

processes:

$P ::=$	0	termination
	$\text{get}(Q, x).P$	consume
	$\text{del}(Q, x).P$	delete
	$\text{ins}(\lambda, e).P$	publish
	$P + P$	choose
	X	process variable
	$\text{rec}X.P$	recursion
	$\exists a : \text{Loc}(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{I}).P$	select location

ignore this for the moment

processes:

$P ::=$	0	termination
	$\text{get}(Q, x).P$	consume
	$\text{del}(Q, x).P$	delete
	$\text{ins}(\lambda, e).P$	publish
	$P + P$	choose
	X	process variable
	$\text{rec}X.P$	recursion
	$\exists a : \text{Loc}(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{I}).P$	select location

systems:

$S ::=$	0	termination
	D	stored data
	$\alpha[P]$	tagged process
	$S \parallel S$	interleave

ignore this for the moment

processes:

$P ::=$	0	termination
	$\text{get}(Q, x).P$	consume
	$\text{del}(Q, x).P$	delete
	$\text{ins}(\lambda, e).P$	publish
	$P + P$	
	X	
	$\text{rec}X.P$	
	$\exists a: \text{Loc}(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{I}).P$	

$$\frac{e \Downarrow C_1^{p_1} \parallel \dots \parallel C_m^{p_m}}{\alpha[\text{ins}(\ell, e).P] \longrightarrow \alpha[P] \parallel C_1^{(\alpha, \ell) \cdot p_1} \parallel \dots \parallel C_m^{(\alpha, \ell) \cdot p_m}}$$

systems:

$S ::=$	0	termination
	D	stored data
	$\alpha[P]$	tagged process
	$S \parallel S$	interleave

ignore this for the moment

processes:

$P ::= 0$ termination
 $| \text{get}(Q, x).P$ consume
 $| \text{del}(Q, x).P$ delete
 $| \text{ins}(\lambda, e).P$ publish
 $| P + P$
 $| X$
 $| \text{rec}X.P$
 $| \exists a: \text{Loc}(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{I}).P$ select location

$$\frac{e \Downarrow C_1^{p_1} \parallel \dots \parallel C_m^{p_m}}{\alpha[\text{ins}(\ell, e).P] \longrightarrow \alpha[P] \parallel C_1^{(\alpha, \ell) \cdot p_1} \parallel \dots \parallel C_m^{(\alpha, \ell) \cdot p_m}}$$

systems:

$S ::= 0$ termination
 $| D$ stored data
 $| \alpha[P]$ tagged process
 $| S \parallel S$ interleave

$$\alpha[\text{get}(\exists a. \exists b. (a \text{ p } b)^{(__, \ell) \cdot \top}, x). \text{del}(\exists a. \exists b. (a \text{ p } b)^{(\alpha, m) \cdot (__, \ell) \cdot \top}, y). \text{ins}(m, x).0]$$

Types & Access control policies

Site policy for Retrieval, Deletion and Insertion:

$\ell : \text{Loc}(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{I})$

*provenance patterns
describing allowed actions*

Eg, insertion policy for Southampton might be:

$\{\langle \text{Groth}, \top \rangle, \langle \text{Buneman}, (\text{Moreau}, \text{Soton}) \cdot \top \rangle\}$

Then, for all D and C^p

$\vdash \text{Groth}[\text{ins}(\text{Soton}, D).0]$

$\text{Groth}[\text{ins}(\text{Soton}, C^p).0] \rightarrow \text{Groth}[0] \parallel C^{(\text{Groth}, \text{Soton}) \cdot p}$

Yet $\vdash \text{Buneman}[\text{ins}(\text{Soton}, D).0]$ only if the provenances of
all of D are of the kind $(\text{Moreau}, \text{Soton}) \dots$

Fancy more like this?

If in your wisdom you want to see more of my work on linked data, please go to:

<http://eprints.soton.ac.uk>

and search “*sassone linked data*”

<http://id.ecs.soton.ac.uk/person/9724>