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## Introduction

Protocol contribution to reflect changes in ARC-2016-0544R03-CR-Standardize\_Default\_ACP\_Privileges

*“To promote interoperability and address issues encountered at the 3rd oneM2M Interop Event, this contribution proposes that by default a creator of a resource shall have full access control privileges to resources it creates. A Hosting CSE shall apply this default when 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).”*

R01 – rebaseline to V3.7.0

Address email comments

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

#### Check authorization of the originator

Depending on the target resource type, the Hosting CSE shall use *accessControlPolicyIDs* of the different resources.

* If the resource type does not have the *accessControlPolicyIDs* attribute definition, the Hosting CSE shall evaluate the *accessControlPolicyIDs* associated with the parent of that resource (e.g. for <schedule>, <oldest>, <latest>, <contentInstance>)
* Some resources provide specific handling for the *accessControlPolicyIDs* attribute, for such resources these procedures are to be followed (e.g. handling given in TS-0001 clause 9.6 for <container>, <m2mServiceSubscriptionProfile>, <serviceSubscribedNode>).
* For other resources, the Hosting CSE shall evaluate the *accessControlPolicyIDs* of the resource. In case *accessControlPolicyIDs* attribute value is **not** set, or does not point to a valid resource or is not reachable then the following default policy shall apply. The Hosting CSE shall provide access privileges to only the creator of the resource. The Hosting CSE shall keep track of the creator of the resource even if the resource does not support a creator attribute. The default access privilege shall grant the creator unrestricted access to the resource, i.e. it shall include all possible operations for that resource. All other entities shall be denied access by default.

The evaluation procedure shall be performed as following:

1. The Hosting CSE retrieves the access control rules from *privilege* attribute of the <accessControlPolicy> which is linked as the *accessControlPolicyIDs*. If the target is <accessControlPolicy> resource, it retrieves the rules from *selfPrivilege* attribute instead.
2. The Hosting CSE checks the following conditions for the access control rules. If there is any rule satisfying all conditions then the evaluation is successful, otherwise it is failed. For more details, see the clause 7.1.5 in TS-0003 [7].
* *accessControlOriginators* of the rule includes the Originator information. The accessControlOriginators parameter comprises a list of domain, CSE-IDs, AE-IDs, the resource-ID of a <group> resource that contains <AE> or <remoteCSE> as member or Role-ID. The accessControlOriginators parameter can be set to reserved keyword "all" to grant access to all originators. It is allowed to include the wildcard character, "\*", into the URI string of domain, CSE-ID and AE‑ID at any level. See the clause 9.6.2.1 in TS-0001 [6].

Table 7.3.3.15‑1 Types of Parameters in *accessControlOriginators*

| Name | Description | Wildcard applicability |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *domain* | A M2M-SP-ID representing domain | Allowed |
| *originatorID* | CSE-ID | Allowed |
| AE-ID | Allowed |
| *group* | The resource-ID of a <group> resource which contains <AE> or <remoteCSE> as member | Not allowed |
| *all* | Any Originators are allowed | Not allowed |
| *Role-ID* | A Role Identifier as defined in clause 7.1.14 of TS-0001 [6] | Not allowed |

* *accessControlContexts* of the rule includes the request context, if the rule includes the *accessControlContexts.*
* If the accessControlOriginators includes a groupID, the Hosting CSE checks if the Originator is a member of that group resource.
* *accessControlOperations* of the rule matches the operation type of the request.
* If the *accessControlAuthenticationFlag* is TRUE, then access control rule applies only if the Originator is considered to be authenticated by the Hosting CSE according to clause 7.1.2 in TS-0003 [7].

If the evaluation failed, and the Hosting CSE does not support Dynamic Authorization, authorization failure information shall be returned to the Originator. If the evaluation failed and the Hosting CSE supports Dynamic Authorization, then it shall trigger Dynamic Authorization. For more details, see the clause 7.3 in TS-0003 [7]. If Dynamic Authorization results in a failure, authorization failure information shall be returned to the Originator.

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