



UNIVERSIDADE
BEIRA INTERIOR



Modeling Natural Language Policies into Controlled Natural Language: A Twitter Case Study

Special Session along with ICIMP 2020
The Fifteenth International Conference on
Internet Monitoring and Protection
September 27, 2020 to October 01, 2020
Lisbon, Portugal

<https://www.aria.org/conferences2020/ICIMP20.html>

Authors:

Irfan Tanoli - irfan.khan.tanoli@ubi.pt

Sebastião Pais - sebastiao@di.ubi.pt



PRESENTER

- Irfan Khan Tanoli
 - Post-Doc Researcher at University of Beira Interior.
 - Receive PhD Degree at Gran Sasso Science Institute, L'Aquila, Italy.
 - Received the M.S degree in software engineering from Technical University of Madrid, Madrid, Spain.
 - Current Research Interest
 - Natural Language Processing.
 - Controlled Natural Processing.
 - Semantic Analysis.
 - Software Engineering.
 - Machine Learning.
 - Current Research Project
 - Moves Project (<http://moves.di.ubi.pt/>).





CO-PRESENTER

- **Sebastião Pais**
 - Professor at the Computer Science Department, the University of Beira Interior.
 - Researcher at NOVA-LINCS and GREYC Laboratory.
 - Current research and teaching interests:
 - Artificial Intelligence.
 - Statistical Natural Language Processing.
 - Lexical Semantics.
 - Machine Learning.
 - Unsupervised and Language-Independent Methodologies.
 - Current Research Project:
 - Moves (<http://moves.di.ubi.pt/>).
 - C4 - Cloud Computing Competence Centre (c4.ubi.pt).





OUTLINE

- Introduction
- Background
- Controlled Natural Languages
- Properties
- Expression in CNLs
- Evaluation
- Outcome
- Conclusion





Introduction

- On social networks, the **storage, usage, and sharing** of users data is regulated by privacy policies, mainly written in natural language.
- To regulate diverse data operations, social network providers (**Facebook, Google, Twitter** etc.) publish appropriate data policies on their sites and invite users to accept them
- However,
 - **Natural language** (e.g., **English**) is readable and understandable, but:
 - **Policies may be ambiguous.**
 - **Policies are not machine readable.**
- No automatic control on how data are actually going to be used and processed





Background

- A systemic comparison of five machine-oriented, English-based **Controlled Natural Languages (CNLs)**, originally designed within different contexts to identify a CNL as final target of our translation.
- Investigate their effectiveness in expressing **6** different data policies as specified on a **popular SN site** (i.e., **Twitter**).
- Evaluate against well-defined classification scheme known as **'PENS (Precision, Expressiveness, Naturalness and Simplicity)'** and a new property **Policy Enforcement**.
- Apart for the contribution, the result of this study can also be useful for other researchers to select a specific CNL for their research work.



Controlled Natural Languages

- Three different policy based controlled natural languages:
- **Attempto Controlled English (ACE)**
 - A subset of standard English with a restricted **syntax** and restricted **semantics** described by a small set of **construction** and **interpretation rules**.
 - Developed for an **automatic** and **unambiguous** translation into a **first-order logic**.
 - Later improved with time and focus more towards **knowledge representation** and application for the **Semantic Web**.





Controlled Natural Languages

- **Protune (Provisional Trust Negotiation) policy language)**
 - Based on logic programming and, like CNL4DSA.
 - Designed for policy evaluation, enforcement, and negotiation.
- **Logic Based Policy Analysis Framework (LBPAF)**
 - A logic-based policy analysis language for policy specifications.
 - It also consists a policy analyser providing diagnostic information about detected conflicts, separation of duty, coverage gaps, behavioral simulation and policy comparison.



Properties

- **Precision**
 - The **degree** to which the meaning of a text can be directly understood and recovered from its textual form in a particular language, i.e., **the sequence of linguistic symbols**.
- **Expressiveness**
 - The range of propositions that a language is capable of expressing.
 - **PENS** considers the following characteristics of expressiveness:
 - **universal quantification over individuals**
 - **relations of arity greater than one, i.e., languages which functions/predicates taking as input more than one argument.**
 - **general rule structures, e.g., if-then-else conditions.**
 - **Negation (failure or strong negation).**



Properties

- **Naturalness**
 - How a language is `natural', in terms of reading and understanding from the user standpoint.
- **Simplicity**
 - How much simple (**resp., complex**) is to describe the language in an exact and comprehensive manner, covering syntax and semantics.
- **Policy Enforcement**
 - A language is policy enforceable or not?





Expression in CNLs

Consider following Twitter policy

P1: You can choose to upload and sync your address book on Twitter so that we can help you find and connect with people.

P1 in ACE:

IF You can choose to upload and sync your address book on Twitter
THEN we can help you **P2 in ACE:** find and connect with people.





Expression in CNLs

- P1 in Protune:

allow (help(we,you,(FindandConnect(people))))
ChoosetoUpload (you,address book, Twitter),
ChoosetoSync (you,address book, Twitter)



- P1 in LBAPF:

permitted(W,Y,help(P,find,connect,T)
do(Y,C,AB,TW,ChoosetoUpload,T), do
(Y,AB,TW,sync,T)





Evaluation

	ACE	Protune	LBPAF
Precision	Yes	Yes	Yes
Expressiveness	Yes	Yes	Yes
Naturalness	No	No	No
Simplicity	No	Yes	Yes
Policy Enforcement	No	Yes	Yes

TABLE: COMPARISON OF CONTROLLED NATURAL LANGUAGES





Outcome

- The evaluation shows that **Protune** and **LBPAF** fulfil the highest number of properties.
- They are **formal** at the **syntactic level** and have an associated **formal semantics**.
- Description is **concise**.
- They were not defined with a specific **vocabulary** associated
- Both have a **policy enforcement** infrastructure associated.
- **Protune** and **LBPAF** enjoy the property of medium expressiveness.





Conclusion

- We considered three **Controlled Natural Languages** and we evaluated them according to a set of **standard properties** defined in the literature.
- The evaluation is carried out based on the translation of a **Twitter policies** into the analysed **CNLs**.
- Aiming at choosing a **CNL** as the target language to automatically translate NL social network(s) data policies, the outcome of our evaluation helps us towards **Protune** and **LBPAF**.



THANK YOU

