OASIS Cloud Authorization TC

# Resolution of comments received for Public Review 01 for Committee Note Draft 01

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Comment URL | Comment | TC Resolution |
| <https://tools.oasis-open.org/issues/browse/TAB-986> | The [Needham] reference is not used anywhere in the document body. | Accepted to be incorporated into draft. |
| <https://tools.oasis-open.org/issues/browse/TAB-982> | In the Process flow of Use Case 5, some apparent actors are used (see upper case words POLICY\_AUTHOR, ATTRIBUTE\_PROVIDER ) that have not been defined in the Actors section: "The POLICY\_AUTHOR writes a policy that only provides access to PROTECTED\_RESOURCE if the SPECIFIC \_SUBJECT is OVER\_21." "The ATTRIBUTE\_PROVIDER asserts that SPECIFIC\_SUBJECT is over 21 and ..." Also, some entities like: PROVIDER\_RELIABIITY\_INDEX , SPECIFIC\_SUBJECT are used that are not defined. | Accepted to be incorporated into draft.*Draft will fix the actors and services in Use Case 5.* |
| <https://tools.oasis-open.org/issues/browse/TAB-983> | The process flow sections seem to use very inconsistent styles from one use case to the other: - some define numbered steps (UC #2), some use bullet lists (UC #3), some just a sequence of paragraphs (see UC #5). - the font vary from Courier, Calibri, Arial. - the font size varies as well. (10, 11) Even inside a single section two fonts are used (see UC #2, #4) | Accepted to be incorporated into draft.*Used Cambria font consistently across the document.* |
| <https://tools.oasis-open.org/issues/browse/TAB-984> | Normally, we would expect Actors defined for a use case, to appear in the Process flow. But that is not always the case: - in UC #8: "Cloud Authorization Service " seems to be an actor, but is in fact a service. We don't know what role the only defined actor (Policy Decision Point) is playing. - for UC #4, 5 actors are defined. But the process flow section says N/A. Aren't there scenarios where these actors may be involved illustrating that use case? - for UC #5, besides the apparent use of (upper case) identifiers not really defined in process flow, the "attribute authority" actor is not used (is it same as ATTRIBUTE\_PROVIDER ?) - for UC #9, "Policy Decision Point" actor not appearing in the process flow while it sure plays a role. (e.g. it appers in UC #10) | TC rejected this. |
| <https://tools.oasis-open.org/issues/browse/TAB-985> | Normally, it is expected that "Notable Services" defined for a use case, be used in the process flow. Even if the service is not necessary to the use case, because it is described as "notable" then the flow should mention how it can be optionally used. But that is not always the case: - in UC #6, #7, no notable services show in the process flow. - in UC #9, the only notable service does not show in the process flow (just a hint of how it is used). - in UC #10, the only notable service does not show in the process flow. - in UC #11, only one service shows in the process flow. - in UC #12, the services ("- Cloud Authorization Service"...) do not show in the process flow. Or else, if a service is not shown in process flow, it should be at least clearly defined so that one has a precise idea of what it is performing. A good use case with respect to the point of this issue, is UC #3 which defines well enough (if succinctly) what its Services do, and also illustrates them in its process flow. | TC rejected this. |