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## Introduction

In TS-0001, *accessControlPolicyIDs* description, it is mentioned that acp linked with accessControlPolicyIDs can be present on some remote CSEs as highlighted below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *accessControlPolicyIDs* | The attribute contains a list of identifiers of an *<accessControlPolicy>* resource. The privileges defined in the *<accessControlPolicy>* resource that are referenced determine who is allowed to access the resource containing this attribute for a specific purpose (e.g. Retrieve, Update, Delete, etc.).If a resource type does not have an *accessControlPolicyIDs* attribute definition, then the *accessControlPolicyIDs* for that resource is governed in a different way, for example, the *accessControlPolicy* associated with the parent may apply to a child resource that does not have an *accessControlPolicyIDs* attribute definition, or the privileges for access are fixed by the system. Refer to the corresponding resource type definitions and procedures to see how access control is handled in such cases.If a resource type does have an *accessControlPolicyIDs* attribute definition, but the (optional) *accessControlPolicyIDs* attribute is not set, or it is set to a value that does not correspond to a valid, existing *<accessControlPolicy>* resource, or it refers to an *<accessControlPolicy>* resource that is not reachable (e.g. because it is located on a remote CSE that is offline or not reachable), then the system default access privileges shall apply.All resources are accessible if and only if the privileges (i.e. shored as *privileges* or *selfPrivileges* attribute of <accessControlPolicy> resource) allow it, therefore all resources shall have an associated *accessControlPolicyIDs* attribute, either explicitly (setting the attribute in the resource itself) or implicitly (either by using the parent privileges or the system default policies). Which means that the system shall provide a default access privileges in case that the Originator does not provide a specific *accessControlPolicyIDs* during the creation of the resource.To update this attribute, a Hosting CSE shall check whether an Originator has Update permission in any *selfPrivileges* of the *<accessControlPolicy>* resources which this attribute originally indicates. |

### But there is no procedure mentioned in TS-0001 and TS-0004(**section 7.3.3.15 check authorization of the originator**) for how to go to remote CSE to get linked ACP. It could be an expensive process because just for providing the authorization, it would mean hopping to many nodes with a new retrieve request for finding the linked <accessControlPolicy> as depicted in the diagram below:



So one proposal is to delete this line.

Or

Another proposal to provide mechanism to get remotely located ACPs

### -----------------------Start of change 1----------------------------------------------

***Depending upon the decision taken***

### -----------------------End of change 1----------------------------------------------
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