

HRAC RFP Submission: Outstanding Issues

Title	Consistent Terminology
ID	7
Should be addressed in	Initial
Description	Can we define some consistent Terminology?
Date Issued	8/10/98
Depends on Issues	11, 12, 13
Pointed by	Carol Burt
Related Refs	msg00039.html
To propose a resolution	David Chizmadia to fill in sectio
Proposed Resolution	

Title	Word "operation" is reserved in CORBA
ID	23
Should be addressed in	Initial
Description	This is the AccessDecision interface. I'm requesting that we not use the term "operation" as an identifier for the first parameter. This is because it can be confused with an operation on a CORBA interface. This is clearly one way that the parameter might be used, but this type of operation might also be considered a subclass resource and the operation would be "use". And it has little meaning when the resource is actually a parameter of a CORBA operation.
Date Issued	9/11/98
Depends on Issues	No dependencies
Pointed by	Carol Burt
Related Refs	http://cadse.cs.fiu.edu/omg/hrac-rfp/pdf00004.pdf
To propose a resolution	Carol Burt
Proposed Resolution	I'm suggesting that this word be changed to "intent"... to clearly indicate that we expect it to be (but obviously don't require) things like "read, write, update, use, I think I could actually make an argument that it isn't needed at all (or should be a "requested_right")... but I haven't thought about that enough.

Title	Use cases for the proposed interfaces
ID	25
Should be addressed in	Initial
Description	The submission needs use cases to: 1. To see if the proposed design will satisfy most of the cases of the facility use, 2. To show how the proposed facility should be used.
Date Issued	9/11/98
Depends on Issues	No dependencies
Pointed by	
Related Refs	No additional references
To propose a resolution	John Barkley and Konstantin
Proposed Resolution	

Title	ASTM Access Control Matrix security standard
ID	26
Should be addressed in	Initial
Description	"Has anyone looked at the ASTM standard? It would be most PC to include a reference...if it applies."
Date Issued	10/ 6/98
Depends on Issues	No dependencies
Pointed by	Mary Kratz
Related Refs	E-mail message effort Mary to the submission list on 10/1/98
To propose a resolution	Nobody Assigned
Proposed Resolution	

Title	Removing resource subtrees and nodes
ID	33
Should be addressed in	Initial
Description	Should we allow two methods, one to remove a resource node and one to remove a resource name subtree?
Date Issued	9/15/98
Depends on Issues	No dependencies
Pointed by	Bart de Greef
Related Refs	Minutes of the submitters meeting in Seattle on September 15, 1998
To propose a resolution	Nobody Assigned
Proposed Resolution	

Title	Time associated with dynamic attributes
ID	35
Should be addressed in	Initial
Description	Should the dynamic attribute method support the notion of time, so that a relationship can be remembered" to exist in the past and not only at the present time?
Date Issued	9/15/98
Depends on Issues	No dependencies
Pointed by	Konstantin Beznosov
Related Refs	Minutes of the submitters meeting in Seattle on September 15, 1998
To propose a resolution	Nobody Assigned
Proposed Resolution	

Title	Quality of Protection as an authorization decision factor
ID	6
Should be addressed in	Revised
Description	Should current quality of protection policy information in ADO client be used as a factor in authorization decisions as principal credentials are?
Date Issued	8/10/98
Depends on Issues	No dependencies
Pointed by	Konstantin Beznosov
Related Refs	msg00055.html -- msg00057.html
To propose a resolution	
Proposed Resolution	

Title	Type of the policy name
ID	27
Should be addressed in	Revised
Description	Should policy name be opaque, string, or something else. Policy name is something which depends on a particular policy evaluator. For some policy evaluators, policy name being a string is not convenient at all.
Date Issued	10/ 7/98
Depends on Issues	No dependencies
Pointed by	Konstantin Beznosov
Related Refs	No additional references
To propose a resolution	Nobody Assigned
Proposed Resolution	

Title	Multiple use of resource name
ID	34
Should be addressed in	Revised
Description	Add text to the submission explaining that real world resource can be defined and used multiple times. There is no way to prevent it
Date Issued	9/15/98
Depends on Issues	No dependencies
Pointed by	
Related Refs	Minutes of the submitters meeting in Seattle on September 15, 1998
To propose a resolution	Nobody Assigned
Proposed Resolution	

Title	ADO interfaces Exceptions
ID	2
Should be addressed in	Final
Description	<p>What exceptions should be raised by ADO's methods? Should it be the matter of a policy whether ADO raises an exception when something goes wrong or silently denies access to a resource? Three possible directions are identified:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Methods raise no exceptions 2. Methods raise exceptions <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Methods raise only system exceptions (like NO_PERMISSION, BAD_PARAM, NOT_IMPLEMENT) b. Methods raise system and application exceptions,
Date Issued	8/11/98
Depends on Issues	
Pointed by	Konstantin Beznosov
Related Refs	mail list archive messages # msg00040.html, msg00054.html
To propose a resolution	
Proposed Resolution	

Title **Exception(s) raised by multiple_action_access_allowed() method in ADO interface**

ID 4

Should be addressed in Final

Description From her message: "Should access decision methods throw exceptions at all... an audit log should have this info... but not the client... seems it should be a binary decision."
Derived from a conference call discussion:
How would a programmer use an exception returned by multiple_action_access_allowed() method?
Is not it better return any problem indications in the returned sequence instead of raising an exception?

Date Issued 8/10/98

Depends on Issues 2

Pointed by Carol Burt

Related Refs

To propose a resolution

Proposed Resolution

Title **Correct name of the specified functionality: no "access control" but "authorization decisions"**

ID 18

Should be addressed in Final

Description "HRAC" stands for healthcare resource access control. Clearly, the functionality for which the RFP is asking (and what a submission is supposed to specify) is concern only with making authorization decisions, i.e. no actual access control is in the scope of the RFP. Thus, the specified functionality should be renamed from "access control" to something else that would reflect the fact that it specifies only authorization decision part, i.e. not control.

Date Issued 8/11/98

Depends on Issues No dependencies

Pointed by Konstantin Beznosov

Related Refs msg00110.html

To propose a resolution

Proposed Resolution

Title	Facility or Service
ID	21
Should be addressed in	Final
Description	Should the final functionality be called a "facility", "service", or something else?
Date Issued	8/11/98
Depends on Issues	No dependencies
Pointed by	Konstantin Beznosov
Related Refs	No additional references
To propose a resolution	Nobody Assigned
Proposed Resolution	