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## Introduction

This contribution proposes some additional updates to the previous solution that was proposed and accepted into TR-0050 for Key Issue #6: Hard to determine if an entity has authorization.

Specifically, the contribution is further developing the solution to add missing details.

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

1.

### Solution #1.7: Hard to determine if an entity has authorization

#### 6.3.7.1 Introduction

As described in clause 6.2.6.1, there are two requirements described:

1. Enhance the Discovery request to allow the specification of one or more permissions that should be present in the list of resources returned by the discovery.
	1. Currently, oneM2M checks that the originator has DISCOVERY permission.
2. Define a primitive that answers the questions “What permissions does ‘originator-ID’ have for ‘resourceXYZ’”?
	1. A variation of #2, that supports #1 is “Does ‘originator-ID’ have ‘permission-X’ for ‘resourceXYZ’”?

If we view ‘resourceXYZ’ as the target of a request primitive and ‘originator-ID’ as the originator of a request primitive, then a solution that is consistent with existing oneM2M procedures is adding a new **Result Content** type:

* **Permissions**: A representation of the permissions that the originator has for the targeted resource. This would be a consolidated representation of all the ACPs associated with this resource for this originator. (this addresses #2 above – not #1 or #2a)

We can view ‘permission-X’ as a new type of ***filter Criteria*** that can be added to **Table 8.1.2-2: *Filter Criteria conditions.*** This parameter would be valid only for filterUsage = ‘discovery’.

| Condition tag | Multiplicity | Description |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Matching Conditions** |
| *operations* | 0..n | A matched resource has a linked <accessControlPolicy> that grants the originator access to perform the specified *operations*. Default is ‘discovery’. |
| *locations* | 0..n | A matched resource has a linked <accessControlPolicy> that grants the originator access when in the specified *locations* |
| *roles* | 0..n | A matched resource has a linked <accessControlPolicy> that grants the originator access when using the specified *roles* |
| *timeWindows* | 0..n | A matched resource has a linked <accessControlPolicy> that grants the originator access during the specified *timeWindows* |

Discovery responses currently provide a list of all matched resources when the “discovery” permission is granted. This behavior could be maintained for backward compatibility by enhancing the result of the discovery response.

For example, child resource References provide additional details about a uri when returned in a response. That behavior can be extended to include a “granted” or “denied” value with each returned URI.

#### m2m:childResourceRef

Table 6.3.7‑1: Type Definition of m2m:childResourceRef

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Element Path | **Element Data Type**  | Multiplicity | Note |
| (base content) | xs:anyURI | 1 | URI of the child resource using the addressing format specified by the ***Desired Identifier Result Type*** request attribute. |
| @name | m2m:resourceName | 1 | *Gives the* **name** *of the child resource pointed to by the URI* |
| @type | m2m:resourceType | 1 | *Gives the resourceType of the child resource pointed to by the URI* |
| @specializationID | xs:anyURI | 0..1 | *Gives resource type specialization of the child resource pointed to by the URI in case @type represents a <flexContainer>*  |
| @permission | xs:permission | 0..n | *Specifies that permission for the specified operation is either ‘granted’ or ‘denied’. This value is included when “operations”, “locations”, “roles” or “timeWindows” is included in the filterCriteria of the request.* |

If only the URI list is returned, then only resources that match the requested operations would be returned.

This solution addresses #1 and #2a.

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