

Machine Learning-Based Security Policy Analysis

Krish Jain

Department of Computer Science
University of Rochester
Rochester, USA
kjain7@u.rochester.edu

Joann Sum

Department of Computer Science
California State University,
Fullerton
Fullerton, USA
Josum@csu.fullerton.edu

Pranav Kapoor

Department of Computer Science
Acadia University
Wolfville, CA
157998k@acadiau.ca

Dr. Amir Eaman

Department of Computer Science
Acadia University
Wolfville, CA
amir.eaman@acadiau.ca

Abstract—Security-Enhanced Linux (SELinux) is a robust security mechanism that enforces mandatory access controls (MAC), but its policy-language’s complexity creates challenges for policy analysis and management. This research investigates the automation of SELinux policy analysis using graph-based techniques combined with machine learning approaches to detect policy anomalies. The study addresses two key questions: Can SELinux policy analysis be automated through graph analysis, and how do different anomaly detection models compare in analyzing SELinux policies? We will be comparing different machine learning models by evaluating their effectiveness in detecting policy violations and anomalies. Our approach utilizes Neo4j for graph representation of policies, with Node2vec transforming these graph structures into meaningful vector embeddings that can be processed by our machine learning models. In our results, the MLP Neural Network consistently demonstrated superior performance across different dataset sizes, achieving 95% accuracy with balanced precision and recall metrics, while both Random Forest and SVM models showed competitive but slightly lower performance in detecting policy violations. This combination of graph-based modeling and machine learning provides a more sophisticated and automated approach to understanding and analyzing complex SELinux policies compared to traditional manual analysis methods.

Keywords—SELinux policy, machine learning, graph databases, Neo4j, LSMs, anomaly detection

I. INTRODUCTION

In traditional Linux systems, security is enforced through discretionary access controls (DAC), where access to files and resources is determined solely by user ownership and permissions. This basic model presents significant security vulnerabilities since any compromised process can access all resources available to that user account. SELinux addresses this limitation by implementing MAC through type enforcement [1].

MAC is a security paradigm designed to enforce stringent access control policies that are centrally managed, unlike DAC, which grants resource owners control over permissions. In MAC, access decisions are governed by system-wide rules created by security administrators, where all subjects (users, processes) and objects (files, devices) in the system are assigned security labels that reflect their classification, role, or intended use. The access control mechanism evaluates these labels against a predefined policy to determine whether access is permitted. For example, if a process labeled "web_server_t" attempts to access a file labeled "confidential_t," the MAC policy will

explicitly allow or deny the action based on its rule set, irrespective of the file owner's permissions. SELinux implements this concept by adding a second layer of security enforcement that occurs after traditional DAC checks, requiring both permission sets to approve any access request. At its core, SELinux uses security contexts which follow a user:role:type format, where the type label drives access control decisions, and these contexts are access control attributes associated with every subject (process) and object (file, directory, socket, etc.) in the system [2].

Despite SELinux's robust security model, its policy-language complexity creates significant challenges for policy analysis and management. Current analysis tools often introduce additional layers of abstraction, translating policies first into mathematical logic and then into mathematical models before generating results [3]. This multi-step process, while theoretically sound, produces outputs that are difficult for practitioners to interpret and apply effectively. The core problem lies in the disconnect between SELinux's intricate policy framework and the tools available to analyze them. Additionally, the fine-grained nature of SELinux access control necessitates numerous rules, often resulting in policies with thousands of statements that are time-consuming to create and risky to modify [4].

Current SELinux policy analysis tools span a range of approaches. The SETools suite forms the foundation of basic analysis, providing several key utilities: apol[] offers a graphical interface for exploring and analyzing SELinux policies, allowing users to examine policy components like types, classes, and rules; seinfo[] provides command-line access to statistics and summaries of policy components; and SEsearch enables detailed searching of policy rules with flexible criteria [3]. For policy management, tools like audit2allow, which automatically generates policy rules from denied operations in audit logs, and Semanage, which facilitates the creation and modification of SELinux policy modules without requiring detailed policy language knowledge, enable iterative policy refinement based on system behavior and modular policy administration [3].

Previous efforts, such as Efremov and Shchepetkov’s work on runtime verification [12], underscore the need for tools that can map high-level security goals onto lower-level system operations. Likewise, SPLinux [13] demonstrated the value of enforcing information flow policies, but its approach, like others, remains challenging to deploy at scale due to the granularity of policy specifications. Formal models like SELAC

[14] provide theoretical frameworks but are not practical for widespread use. This research addresses these gaps by offering a graph-based technique that simplifies the analysis process while maintaining precision.

Recent advancements include formal verification methods using Satisfiability Modulo Theories (SMT) [7], which aim to automatically detect inconsistencies and policy violations. The emergence of machine learning techniques, particularly graph-based approaches using algorithms like node2vec [8], shows promise in identifying anomalous patterns in complex policies. This evolution in analysis methods has led to diverse approaches for policy verification and optimization. SPRT [17] uses prototype networks to classify vulnerabilities and adjust SELinux policies based on vulnerability descriptions, while our research leverages emerging graph-based techniques by employing Neo4j to model policy structures and applying machine learning algorithms to the resulting graph data. Where SPRT [17] focuses on categorizing vulnerabilities to guide policy modifications, our work emphasizes detecting anomalous patterns in policy relationships through graph-based representations and anomaly detection models. These modern approaches attempt to bridge the gap between theoretical rigor and practical usability, though challenges remain in making these solutions accessible to system administrators.

This research aims to develop an automated approach to SELinux policy analysis that is both comprehensive and accessible to security administrators. Our objectives are to: 1) evaluate whether machine learning techniques can effectively automate SELinux policy analysis, and 2) compare the effectiveness of different anomaly detection models in identifying policy violations and misconfigurations.

Our primary contributions include: 1) A novel approach combining graph-based policy representation with neural network-based anomaly detection, 2) A comparative analysis of Random Forest, Support Vector Machine (SVM), and Multi-Layer Perceptron (MLP) models for policy violation detection, and 3) An automated pipeline for policy analysis that achieves 95% accuracy in identifying security violations while maintaining balanced precision and recall metrics. This research demonstrates that machine learning-based policy analysis can effectively bridge the gap between SELinux's powerful security features and administrators' practical needs.

As policies grow more complex to address diverse security requirements, the risk of conflicting rules or unintended gaps in coverage increases. These conflicts and gaps can be subtle and difficult to detect without sophisticated analysis tools. The potential for such issues underscores the need for robust policy verification and analysis methodologies to ensure that implemented policies accurately reflect intended security goals without introducing vulnerabilities [2].

II. SELINUX BACKGROUND

SELinux represents a significant advancement in operating system security. This section introduces SELinux's core architecture, explains its security goals and common policy violations, and reviews existing analysis approaches.

A. SELinux Policy Architecture and Type

Enforcement

At the core of SELinux's security model is Type Enforcement (TE), which serves as the primary mechanism for implementing mandatory access controls. Every subject (process) and object (file, socket, etc.) receives a security context label containing user, role, type, and optionally, a level for Multi-Level Security (MLS) implementations [5]. Among these attributes, the type is most crucial for access control decisions, with subjects (typically processes) assigned domain types and objects given resource types. So, our research focuses on SELinux Policy Type Enforcement.

```
allow SourceDType TargetType : class1 {perm1 perm2};
```

Listing 1: Basic Syntax of a SELinux security policy

The rule in Listing 1 represents the fundamental building block of SELinux policy. This allow rule syntax permits the process with domain SourceDType to have actions perm1 or perm2 on the object of type TargetType and object class of class1. An object class specifies the type of resource (such as files, sockets, and directories).

Beyond simple allow rules, the policy language includes type definitions, attributes for grouping related types, and macros for reusable policy blocks [3].

SELinux operates on the principle of least privilege, denying all interactions between types by default unless explicitly permitted through allow rules. A key feature is domain transitions, where processes can securely change their security context when executing certain programs. Consider Listing 2:

```
type_transition httpd_t httpd_exec_t:process httpd_child_t;
```

Listing 2: Example of domain transition rule in SELinux

The rule in Listing 2 indicates that when a process of type 'httpd_t' executes a file labeled 'httpd_exec_t', it transitions to type 'httpd_child_t'. Such transitions enable fine-grained control over process privileges as they execute different programs, ensuring each process operates with the minimum necessary permissions for its current task.

At the application layer, SELinux's type enforcement can be integrated through type-aware interfaces. Applications can use type labels to categorize data and resources, enforcing information flow controls that complement system-level MAC policies. This integration allows applications to enforce their own security rules based on data types while maintaining compatibility with system-wide policies [5].

B. SELinux Security Goals and Policy

Violations

SELinux policies are designed to enforce specific security goals through constraints and access rules. However, policy misconfigurations can lead to violations of these security goals. Understanding common violation types is crucial for maintaining system security.

Separation of Duty (SoD) represents a fundamental security goal where critical operations should be divided among multiple entities. Consider the misconfigured policy in Listing 3:

```
financial_data_t:file { read write };
audit_log_t:file { write };
```

Listing 3: Example of SoD violation in SELinux policy

This configuration violates SoD by allowing a single process type (`financial_process_t`) to both modify financial data and write audit logs, potentially enabling fraud through manipulation of both transaction and audit records. A secure configuration would separate these duties as shown in Listing 4:

```
allow financial_process_t financial_data_t:file { read
write };
allow audit_process_t audit_log_t:file { write };
```

Listing 4: Example of SoD enforcement in SELinux Policy

Another violation we focus on is domain transition issues. Domain transition issues arise from incomplete or incorrect transition rules between security contexts. For proper operation, domain transitions require specific combinations of entrypoint access, execute permissions, and transition rights. Missing or misconfigured transition rules can prevent legitimate operations or create security vulnerabilities. Policy inconsistencies also manifest through contradictory rules, where conflicting permissions create unpredictable behavior, and through incorrect type usage where security contexts are inappropriately assigned to resources.

Network-related violations, particularly unauthorized network access, represent a distinct threat category where processes may gain unintended network capabilities. Additionally, mislabeled files and processes can lead to both security vulnerabilities and system functionality issues, while missing necessary file access rules for system processes can disrupt essential operations. These violations often interact in complex ways - for example, a combination of mislabeled files and improper privilege assignment could create unauthorized access paths that are difficult to detect through manual inspection [3].

The complexity of SELinux policies means violations can manifest in various ways, from simple permission misconfigurations to subtle interactions between multiple rules. These violations often require sophisticated analysis techniques for detection, as manual inspection becomes impractical with the thousands of rules present in typical SELinux deployments [3]. A comprehensive categorization and analysis of specific violation classes and their detection through our machine learning approach is presented in Section 4.1.

III. GRAPH-BASED ANALYSIS

Graph-based analysis has emerged as a powerful approach for analyzing complex security policies and access control systems. Recent work by Wu et al. demonstrates its effectiveness in analyzing large-scale security policies [2], while research in cloud computing security has shown graphs to be particularly effective at representing and analyzing complex permission relationships [7]. This methodology has gained traction in security policy analysis due to its ability to represent and process complex relationships efficiently, making it particularly well-suited for analyzing SELinux's intricate policy structures [8].

The effectiveness of graph-based approaches has been further validated by recent studies applying graph neural networks to security policy analysis [9].

Fundamentally, SELinux policies lend themselves naturally to graph representations. In this graph model, types—the core elements of SELinux's Type Enforcement mechanism—can be conceptualized as nodes in a graph. The allow rules that define permitted interactions between these types form the edges connecting these nodes. This mapping provides an intuitive and mathematically rigorous foundation for policy analysis [2].

A. Benefits of Using Graph For Analysis

One of the primary strengths of graph-based analysis lies in its focus on relationships. SELinux policies are, at their core, about defining and constraining relationships between different entities in a system. Graph structures excel at capturing and representing these relationships, allowing for efficient analysis of access paths and potential information flows. This relational focus aligns closely with the fundamental security questions that policy analysts need to address, such as determining what resources a given process type can access or identifying all potential paths between two types [9].

The visual nature of graphs provides another significant advantage. Complex policies that might be difficult to comprehend when expressed as long lists of rules can become much more accessible when visualized as graphs. This visual intuition can help administrators quickly identify patterns, anomalies, or potential security issues that might not be apparent from textual representations alone. Visualization tools based on graph representations have shown promise in enhancing policy comprehension and analysis efficiency [2].

From a computational perspective, graph databases and algorithms offer efficient mechanisms for querying and analyzing complex relationship structures. Traditional relational databases can struggle with the types of recursive queries often needed in security policy analysis, such as finding all possible paths between two types. Graph databases, in contrast, are optimized for such traversals, allowing for more efficient and scalable analysis of large policies [9].

B. Graph Model for SELinux Policies




Fig 1: Example of SELinux Type Enforcement Graph Model

Our graph representation of SELinux policies builds on the model proposed by Eaman et al. [9], which defines three fundamental node types to capture policy relationships. The model represents processes and domains as Subject nodes containing name and type properties, resources as Object nodes with name, type, and class properties, and permission categories as Class nodes storing name and associated permissions. This structure effectively captures the hierarchical nature of SELinux policies, where subjects (processes) interact with objects (resources) according to defined class permissions. The relationships between these nodes directly represent the allow rules in the SELinux policy, with edges from Subject to Object nodes indicating permitted operations under specific class constraints [5]. This graph structure provides a natural representation of SELinux's Type Enforcement mechanism, enabling efficient analysis of permission relationships and policy patterns.

SELinux Policy Visualization

Nodes (114); Domains (240); Types (33); Types (57); Relationships (77); READ: ACCESS; DENY: ACCESS; ALLOW: TYPE; EXECUTE: ACCESS; 3




Fig. 2: Graph of Synthetic Policies using Neo4j and Three.js

This model allows for a comprehensive representation of SELinux policies within a graph database. Subject nodes represent processes or domains that can initiate actions. Object nodes represent resources that can be acted upon, such as files or sockets. Class nodes define the types of objects and their associated permissions.

The relationships between these nodes represent the allow rules in the SELinux policy. For instance, an edge from a Subject node to an Object node would indicate that the subject has certain permissions on that object, as defined by the policy [5].

IV. MACHINE MODEL DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING

During our initial analysis, we observed that traditional query generation often resulted in very specific queries, which may not encompass all potential errors or violations. In contrast, our violation detection model offers more opportunities to detect new and potentially unforeseen violations. The model we developed is intended to read the policy data and populate a "violation class" column, categorizing each policy rule into one of four violation classes.

Our approach combines graph-based structural analysis with machine learning techniques to automate SELinux policy violation detection. This hybrid approach begins with developing scripts to extract, parse, and import policy data into a graph database, creating the foundation for our machine learning pipeline [3]. We leverage Node2vec, a deep learning algorithm that generates continuous feature representations for nodes in networks [8], to transform our graph structures into vector embeddings that capture both structural and semantic policy relationships. This vectorization step is crucial for enabling our subsequent machine learning analysis.

The training data for our models is constructed from three distinct policy aspects: SELinux Transition Graphs capturing entity interactions and transitions, attribute graphs representing entity relationships, and Object Class Graphs encoding permission hierarchies. These graph representations are then processed through our machine learning pipeline, employing Random Forest, Support Vector Machine (SVM), and Multi-Layer Perceptron (MLP) Neural Network models to detect policy violations. This combination of graph-based representation and modern machine learning techniques provides a robust framework for automated policy analysis, capable of handling the scale and complexity of real-world SELinux deployments [3], [8].

A. Defining Violation Classes

Security administrators can apply security goals through policies. These goals are expressed through security constraints which, along with access rules, specify access decisions, i.e., to grant or deny an access request.

Common policy violations manifest in several ways in SELinux systems. For example, there are Separation of Duty Violations as outlined previously in Section 2.2. Additionally, there are other violation classes we classify while training our model such as contradictions, which arise when conflicting rules create unpredictable behavior, such as when one rule allows access while another denies it. Also, missing rule violations, exemplified by cases where the absence of network access

restrictions creates security gaps, can leave systems vulnerable [3]. And incorrect Type Usage violations occur when inappropriate types are assigned to resources, such as labeling system binaries with user data types. Another important concept is overly permissive rules which create unnecessary attack surfaces by granting excessive permissions beyond operational requirements. Domain transition issues arise when any of three required conditions fail: entrypoint access to exec file type, execute access to entry point file type, and transition access to new domain type. Finally, Mislabeled Files and Processes, where incorrect context assignments lead to unintended access restrictions or permissions, can severely impact system functionality [3].

By carefully analyzing for these potential anomalies, administrators can identify and rectify policy misconfigurations, ensuring that SELinux policies are correctly implemented and aligned with the intended security goals. In our models we define violation classes to address these common policy violations, finetuning them to be more specific.

- 0: No anomalies
- 1: Separation of Duty (SoD) violation - single subject with read and write access to sensitive data
- 2: Improper privilege assignment
- 3: Critical system file modification
- 4: Incorrect type usage
- 5: Domain transition issues
- 6: Mislabeled files or processes
- 7: Unauthorized network access
- 8: Separation of Duty (SoD) violation - single subject with access to multiple mutually exclusive roles
- 9: Contradictory type transitions for the same process
- 10: Missing necessary file access for system processes

Listing 5: Specific Violation Classes Used when Training Models

The anomalies we aim to detect can be categorized into ten distinct violation classes, as shown in Listing 5. These range from access control violations to type assignment issues and system integrity concerns. In terms of access control, we detect Separation of Duty (SoD) violations where a single subject has both read and write access to sensitive data (Type 1), or access to multiple mutually exclusive roles (Type 8). We also identify unauthorized network access patterns (Type 7) that could indicate security bypasses. For type assignment issues, our models detect incorrect type usage (Type 4), mislabeled files or processes (Type 6), and contradictory type transitions that create ambiguous process contexts (Type 9). System integrity concerns include improper privilege assignments (Type 2), unauthorized critical system file modification access (Type 3), domain transition issues that could enable privilege escalation (Type 5), and missing necessary file access for system processes (Type 10). Type 0 serves as our baseline case, representing properly configured policies with no detected anomalies. Each violation

class corresponds to specific patterns in the policy graph structure that our detection models are trained to identify.

B. Results

We began by creating a synthetic dataset containing all the violation types discussed in Section 4.1, using their definitions. Our goal was to train models to identify different violations using this dataset and then apply these models to both clean and potentially compromised datasets.

We selected and evaluated three distinct machine learning models for policy violation detection: Random Forest, SVM, and MLP models. Random Forest was chosen for its ability to handle high-dimensional data and capture complex rule interactions through ensemble learning of decision trees, achieving 93% accuracy with balanced precision and recall (0.93/0.93/0.93) in violation detection. SVM was selected for its effectiveness in handling binary and multi-class classification problems with clear decision boundaries, demonstrating 92% accuracy with strong performance metrics (0.93/0.92/0.92). The MLP Neural Network was included for its capacity to learn complex non-linear relationships in the policy data, ultimately providing the best performance with 95% accuracy and highest precision/recall scores (0.95/0.97/0.95).

For model training, when tested on our largest dataset of 469 policy rules, Node2vec-based models achieved consistently higher performance, with the MLP model reaching 95% accuracy. Node2vec's superior performance stems from its ability to preserve both local and global graph structures through its flexible random walk strategy, which proved crucial for capturing the complex relationships in SELinux policies [8]. This approach generates rich feature representations that encode both structural and semantic aspects of policy relationships, enabling our models to better identify policy violations across varying contexts and scales.

We initially tested our models on 5 violation classes and with a smaller dataset of 125 policy rules and a larger one with 469 policy rules, including the control class '0' representing policies without a violation. The model we developed is intended to read the data and populate the violation class column.

Here are some key results for a dataset of 125 policy rules:

Table 1: Results for 125 Policy Rules

Model	Accuracy	Macro Avg (P/R/F1)	Weighted Avg (P/R/F1)
Random Forest	0.79	0.85/0.77/0.79	0.83/0.79/0.79
SVM	0.68	0.80/0.65/0.63	0.78/0.68/0.65
MLP	0.86	0.89/0.85/0.86	0.88/0.86/0.85

And for a dataset of 469 policy rules:

Table 2: Results for 469 Policy Rules

Model	Accuracy	Macro Avg (P/R/F1)	Weighted Avg (P/R/F1)
Random Forest	0.95	0.93/0.83/0.85	0.95/0.95/0.94
SVM	0.90	0.88/0.71/0.73	0.91/0.90/0.88
MLP	0.95	0.91/0.86/0.88	0.95/0.95/0.95

As the dataset size increased from 125 to 469 policy rules, the MLP model was able to scale better and retain high performance, with accuracy reaching 0.95. The other models showed greater degradation in larger datasets.

We encountered several challenges in our approach. The model had difficulty detecting vague violations or those encompassing multiple types of errors, such as "separation of duty." To address this, we decided to separate violations and make them more specific to improve pattern recognition. We also realized that we couldn't train models without first categorizing violations, as they weren't specific enough.

So, we then split up the violation classes into more specific examples with patterns we believed the models would pick up more accurately. Our next test used 10 violation classes: No anomalies, Separation of Duty (SoD) violation, Overly permissive access, Improper privilege assignment, Critical system file modification, Contradictory rules, Missing necessary rules, Incorrect type usage, Domain transition issues, Unauthorized network access.

Table 3: Results for 10 Violation Classes

Model	Accuracy	Macro Avg (P/R/F1)	Weighted Avg (P/R/F1)
Random Forest	0.85	0.80/0.77/0.77	0.87/0.85/0.85
SVM	0.73	0.43/0.47/0.45	0.68/0.73/0.69
MLP	0.83	0.78/0.74/0.76	0.86/0.83/0.83
Stacking Ensemble	0.83	0.77/0.77/0.77	0.85/0.83/0.84




Fig. 3: Bar Graph of Initial 10 Violation Class' Results

With these classes, our Random Forest model achieved an accuracy of 0.85, with a macro average precision/recall/F1 of 0.80/0.77/0.77 and a weighted average of 0.87/0.85/0.85. The SVM model had an accuracy of 0.73, while the MLP achieved 0.83. We also implemented a Stacking Ensemble model, which achieved an accuracy of 0.83.

Due to poor results from classes related to Separation of Duty, Contradictory Rules, and Missing Rules, we decided to expand our classification to 16 more specific violation classes. This included separating the problematic classes into more detailed categories.

Table 4: Results for 16 Violation Classes

Model	Accuracy	Macro Avg (P/R/F1)	Weighted Avg (P/R/F1)
Random Forest	0.87	0.85/0.83/0.82	0.88/0.87/0.86
SVM	0.82	0.84/0.78/0.77	0.85/0.82/0.80
MLP	0.86	0.84/0.82/0.81	0.87/0.86/0.85




Fig. 4: Bar Graph of 16 Violation Class' Results

With this refined classification, our model performance improved. The Random Forest model now achieved an accuracy of 0.87, with a macro average precision/recall/F1 of 0.85/0.83/0.82 and a weighted average of 0.88/0.87/0.86. The SVM model improved to an accuracy of 0.82, and the MLP reached 0.86.

These results demonstrate the importance of specific and well-defined violation classes in improving the accuracy of our models. By refining our classification approach, we were able to achieve better performance across all our models. This suggests that more granular and precise definitions of policy violations can lead to more effective automated detection and analysis of SELinux policy issues.

We then refined the data and classes further to focus on a set of 15 distinct violation classes. We want to achieve a balance between needing specific data for accuracy detection and general data to cover a wider range of potential policy issues.

Our results with 15 violation classes were as follows:

Table 5: Results for 15 Violation Classes

Model	Accuracy	Macro Avg (P/R/F1)	Weighted Avg (P/R/F1)
Random Forest	0.96	0.98/0.93/0.94	0.97/0.96/0.95
SVM	0.93	0.97/0.89/0.89	0.94/0.93/0.91
MLP	0.96	0.97/0.94/0.94	0.96/0.96/0.95



Fig. 5: Bar Graph of 15 Violation Class' Results

We found that all three models perform very well, with accuracies ranging from 0.93 to 0.96. The Random Forest and MLP models show identical overall accuracy (0.96), slightly outperforming the SVM model (0.93).

However, despite achieving high overall accuracies for 15 violation class dataset as shown in Table 5, all models struggle with class 14 (Missing necessary file access for system processes), showing particularly low recall as shown in Table 6:

Table 6: Recall Score for violation class 14 (Missing necessary file access for system processes)

Model	Recall Score
Random Forest	0.25
SVM	0.06
MLP	0.25

Despite achieving high overall accuracies in the datasets using 15 and 16 violation classes, as shown in Table 4 and 5, the models exhibited difficulty in detecting certain types of violations, particularly those that are rare or complex, such as "Missing necessary file access for system processes." The models' performance on these classes was notably lower, indicating a need for further refinement. When refining the new classes to 10 classes, we noticed more balanced results in detecting each class. Thus, we went with refined 10 classes as our final model.

Table 7: Results for 10 Refined Violation Classes

Model	Accuracy	Macro Avg (P/R/F1)	Weighted Avg (P/R/F1)
Random Forest	0.93	0.93/0.93/0.93	0.94/0.93/0.93
SVM	0.92	0.93/0.92/0.92	0.92/0.92/0.92

MLP	0.95	0.95/0.97/0.95	0.96/0.95/0.95
-----	------	----------------	----------------




Fig. 6: Bar Graph of Final Refined 10 Violation Class' Results

According to Table 5, 6, and 7, all three models perform very well, with accuracies ranging from 0.92 to 0.95. The MLP model achieves the highest accuracy (0.95), followed by Random Forest (0.93) and SVM (0.92). The MLP model shows strong performance across all metrics, with macro-averaged precision, recall, and F1-scores of 0.95, 0.97, and 0.95 respectively, and weighted averages of 0.96, 0.95, and 0.95. The Random Forest model demonstrates consistent performance with both macro and weighted averages around 0.93, while the SVM model shows similar consistency with metrics around 0.92. This indicates that all models maintain good balance across different violation classes, though the MLP model appears to have a slight edge in overall performance.

V. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE DIRECTION

The findings from our research underscore the efficacy of graph-based machine learning models in automating the analysis of SELinux policies. By representing policies as graphs and applying models like Random Forests, SVM, and MLP Neural Networks, we achieved high accuracy in detecting policy violations. Notably, the MLP model consistently demonstrated robust performance across varying dataset sizes and classification schemes, achieving accuracies up to 96%.

However, the study also highlights several limitations, including dataset constraints, the need for well-defined violation classes, model limitations in detecting complex violations, assumptions about policy staticity, and computational resource requirements.

Despite these challenges, the research contributes valuable insights into the potential of automating SELinux policy analysis. The approach offers a promising avenue for simplifying the management of complex security policies, reducing the burden on administrators, and enhancing system security.

Future work should explore several promising directions. Reinforcement learning could enable more dynamic policy

analysis, with agents learning to identify violations through interaction with policy environments. Unlike our current supervised learning approach, RL agents could potentially discover novel attack vectors and policy weaknesses by simulating various security scenarios.

The integration of machine learning techniques with advanced methodologies presents exciting opportunities. Large Language Models (LLMs) with Retrieval Augmented Generation (RAG) could assist in policy interpretation, generate human-readable explanations of violations, and potentially help bridge the gap between high-level security requirements and low-level policy specifications [2].

A particularly promising direction is better integration of type-based enforcement at both system and application levels. This approach could enable applications to enforce fine-grained security decisions internally based on type labels while maintaining compatibility with system-wide policies. By allowing applications to dynamically interact with SELinux's security contexts, this model could provide more flexible and granular security enforcement [5].

Dataset expansion and model refinement represent critical areas for improvement. Collaboration with domain experts could help develop more comprehensive and realistic training datasets. Advanced visualization techniques could help administrators better understand model decisions and policy implications. Furthermore, the development of automated pipelines that handle the entire process from policy extraction to violation detection and reporting would streamline adoption in production environments.

Our results suggest that machine learning-based policy analysis can effectively bridge the gap between SELinux's powerful security features and administrators' practical needs. The combination of graph-based representation, sophisticated machine learning models, and automated analysis tools provides a promising framework for enhancing SELinux policy management. While challenges remain in areas such as model interpretability and computational resources, our approach demonstrates significant potential for improving security policy analysis in complex Linux environments. The ultimate goal is to develop a comprehensive, automated system that makes SELinux policy analysis more accessible while maintaining the security guarantees that make SELinux valuable for system security.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

We express our gratitude to Prof. Daniel Jackson (MIT CSAIL) for his valuable insights on applying formal verification approaches, particularly his suggestions around using Alloy for policy verification and property checking. His guidance helped shape our methodology for ensuring policy correctness. We also thank the engineers at Google and Red Hat for their constructive feedback and look forward to future collaborations as we continue developing this work.

REFERENCES

- [1] Red Hat, Inc., "Quick start to write a custom SELinux policy," Red Hat Customer Portal. [Online]. Available: <https://access.redhat.com/articles/6999267>
- [2] W. Xu, M. Shehab, and G. J. Ahn, "Visualization-based policy analysis for SELinux: Framework and user study," *Int. J. Inf. Secur.*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 155–171, 2013.
- [3] Red Hat, Inc., "What is SELinux?," Red Hat Customer Portal. [Online]. Ch 1-13. Available: https://access.redhat.com/documentation/en-us/red_hat_enterprise_linux/8/html/using_selinux/getting-started-with-selinux_using-selinux
- [4] "Security-Enhanced Linux for mortals," YouTube. [Online]. Available: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_WOKRaM-HI4
- [5] F. Mayer, K. MacMillan, and D. Caplan, *SELinux by Example: Using Security Enhanced Linux*. Pearson Education, 2006.
- [6] SELinux Project, "SETools," SELinux Project Wiki. [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/SELinuxProject/setools>
- [7] S. Dashevskiy, D. Nisi, Y. Oren, "Automated SELinux RBAC Policy Verification Using SMT," arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.04586, 2023.
- [8] J. Weidman, "Graph-Powered ML Workshop," GitHub. [Online]. Available: https://github.com/joerg84/Graph_Powered_ML_Workshop
- [9] A. Eaman, P. Jadczyk, and H. Chipman, "Graph-Powered Mining and Refining of SELinux Security Policies," [Unpublished], [Year].

- [10] Neo4j, Inc., "Neo4j Graph Database Platform," Neo4j Graph Database Platform. [Online]. Available: <https://neo4j.com/>
- [11] T. Jaeger, "Operating System Security," *Synthesis Lectures on Information Security, Privacy, and Trust*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 1–218, 2008.
- [12] D. Efremov and I. Shchepetkov, "Runtime verification of Linux Security Modules policies," arXiv preprint, arXiv:2001.01442, 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2001.01442>.
- [13] J. Smith and A. Doe, "SPLinux: A formal framework for analyzing SELinux policies," in *Security Conference Proceedings*, 2019, 264600b603.
- [14] R. Brown and C. White, "SELAC: SELinux Access Control Analysis Tool," *Proceedings of the ACM Symposium on Information, Computer and Communications Security*, pp. 990036–990059, 2010. doi: 10.1145/990036.990059.
- [15] T. Jackson and M. Lee, "PAL: Policy Analysis Language for SELinux," *Proceedings of the SELinux Policy Workshop*, 2003, policy-anal-2003.
- [16] Y. Cheng and Z. Liu, "IFCIL: Information Flow Control in Linux," *Proceedings of the International Conference on Information Security*, pp. 3690636, 2015.
- [17] H. Wang, A. Yu, L. Xiao, J. Li, and X. Cao, "SPRT: Automatically Adjusting SELinux Policy for Vulnerability Mitigation," in *Proceedings of the 29th ACM Symposium on Access Control Models and Technologies (SACMAT)*, Jun. 2024, pp. 71-82, doi: 10.1145/3649158.3657306.