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GUIDELINES for Change Requests:

Provide an informative introduction containing the problem(s) being solved, and a summary list of proposals.

Each CR should contain changes related to only one particular issue/problem.

In case of a correction, and the change apply to previous releases, a separate “mirror CR” should be posted at the same time of this CR

Mirror CR: applies only when the text, including clause numbering are exactly the same.

Companion CR: applies when the change means the same but the baselines differ in some way (e.g. clause number).

Follow the principle of completeness, where all changes related to the issue or problem within a deliverable are simultaneously proposed to be made E.g. A change impacting 5 tables should not only include a proposal to change only 3 tables. Includes any changes to references, definitions, and acronyms in the same deliverable.

Follow the drafting rules.

All pictures must be editable.

Check spelling and grammar to the extent practicable.

Use Change bars for modifications.

The change should include the current and surrounding clauses to clearly show where a change is located and to provide technical context of the proposed change. Additions of complete clauses need not show surrounding clauses as long as the proposed clause number clearly shows where the new clause is proposed to be located.

Multiple changes in a single CR shall be clearly separated by horizontal lines with embedded text such as, start of change 1, end of change 1, start of new clause, end of new clause.

When subsequent changes are made to content of a CR, then the accepted version should not show changes over changes. The accepted version of the CR should only show changes relative to the baseline approved text.

## Introduction

According to TS-0004 section 7.4.13.2.1, while doing validation of members, Hosting CSE may have to retrieve members represented by the *memberIDs.*  For retrieving these members, Hosting CSE will need retrieve privileges at these members. If Hosting CSE does not have this privilege it should return the error "RECEIVER\_HAS\_NO\_PRIVILEGE".

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

##### 7.4.13.2.1 Create

Primitive specific operation after Recv-C-6.4 "Check validity of resource representation for the given resource type" and before Recv-C-6.5 "Create/Update/Retrieve/Delete/Notify operation is performed". See clause Error: Reference source not found.

1. Primitive specific operation: Validate the provided attributes. It shall also check whether the number of URIs present in the memberIDs attribute of the group resource representation does not exceed the maximum as specified by the maxNrOfMembers attribute. If the maximum is exceeded, the request shall be rejected with a ***Response Status Code*** indicating "MAX\_NUMBER\_OF\_MEMBER\_EXCEEDED" error. If there are duplicate members in the memberIDs attribute then the duplicate members are removed before creation of the <group> resource.
If the memberType attribute of the <group> resource is not "MIXED", the Hosting CSE shall also verify that all the member IDs including sub-groups in the attribute memberIDs of the <group> resource representation provided in the request shall conform to the memberType of the group resource. To validate a resource type of a member, the Hosting CSE shall check the *resourceType* attribute of the resource which is indicated by the member ID. To check the *resourceType* attribute, the Hosting CSE may retrieve the member resource. When a member ID is virtual resource, the Hosting CSE shall check the *resourceType* attribute of the parent resource. If the resource type of the parent allows this child virtual resource type, the Hosting CSE checks whether the virtual resource type matches with the *memberType* attribute of the group. If they match, then the Hosting CSE considers that the virtual member resource is validated. If the resourceType cannot be retrieved due to lack of privilege, the request shall be rejected with a ***Response Status Code*** indicating "RECEIVER\_HAS\_NO\_PRIVILEGE" error.
2. In the case that the <group> resource contains sub-group member resources, the receiver shall retrieve the memberType of the sub-group member resources to validate the memberType. If the memberType cannot be retrieved due to lack of privilege, the request shall be rejected with a ***Response Status Code*** indicating "RECEIVER\_HAS\_NO\_PRIVILEGE" error. If the sub-group member resources are temporarily unreachable, the receiver shall set the memberTypeValidated attribute of the <group> resource to FALSE and return the result to the originator in the response of the request. As soon as any unreachable sub-group resource becomes reachable, the receiver shall perform the memberType validation procedure. The originator may get to know the validation result by subscribing to the created resource if the memberTypeValidated attribute is FALSE. Upon unsuccessful validation, the receiver shall delete the <group> resource if the ***consistencyStrategy*** of the <group> resource is ABANDON\_GROUP, or remove the inconsistent members from the <group> resource if the consistencyStrategy attribute is ABANDON\_MEMBER, or set the memberType attribute of the <group> resource to "MIXED" if the consistencyStrategy attribute is SET\_MIXED.
3. The *memberTypeValidated* attribute shall be set to TRUE if all the members have been validated successfully. If a member validation for the *memberType* of the <group> resource is unsuccessful, then the Hosting CSE shall perform the following:
	1. If the *consistencyStrategy* of the <group> resource is ABANDON\_GROUP then the request shall be rejected with a ***Response Status Code*** indicating "GROUP\_MEMBER\_TYPE\_INCONSISTENT" error.
4. If the *consistencyStrategy* of the <group> resource is ABANDON\_ MEMBER then remove the inconsistent members and create the <group> resource and the *memberTypeValidated* attribute shall be set to TRUE.
5. If the *consistencyStrategy* of the <group> resource is SET\_ MIXED then set the *memberType* attribute of the <group> resource to "MIXED" and create the <group> resource and the *memberTypeValidated* attribute shall be set to TRUE.

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