**Section A: Nomination**

**To be completed by nominator:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Standard Name: | eXtensible Access Control Markup Language Version 3.0 (Core specification) | | | | Acronym: | XACML 3.0 | | |
| Standards Developer (SD): | OASIS | | SD Status on Standards Developer Inventory : | | Not on Standards Developer Inventory | | | |
| Approved  Declined  Approval rescinded | | **Date of SCC decision:** | |
| 3/20/2015 | |
| Description of standard: | XACML is a general-purpose access control policy language. This means that it provides a syntax (defined in XML) for managing access to resources based on applicable policies combined with asserted facts about (“attributes” of) an authenticated user, the type of access requested, the protected information resource, and the environment or context of the transaction. XACML is used to implement attribute-based access control (ABAC.) | | | | | | | |
| Date initially published: | 1/22/2013 | Current version: | | XACML 3.0 | | **Date published:** | | 1/22/2013 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Relevance to the IDEF:** | Click here to give a brief summary of the relevance of the standard to the IDEF. Refer to SAP v2, Section 4.2, item a for general guidance. | |
| **Compatible with NSTIC Guiding Principles:**  ***(minimum of one)*** | Privacy Enhancing and Voluntary  Secure and Resilient  Interoperable  Cost Effective and Easy-to-use | Privacy-enhancing.—ABAC as implemented with XACML enhances privacy by: (1) eliminating the need for relying-party systems to maintain user accounts with names and other identifying information; (2) supporting implementations that require only the minimum user information required by an access policy; and (3) enabling consistent and detailed compliance with policies on access to privacy-sensitive data of relying parties.  Secure and resilient.—XACML lets custodians of protected information resources enforce compliance with all policies applicable to access to a protected resource at an arbitrarily precise level, e.g, an individual row in a database or even individual data elements within a record. This can dramatically reduce the damage done by malevolent insiders or other attackers who have obtained an authentication credential. [?? Add info on support or guidance for mitigation of common attacks??] Interoperable.—[?? Ref to JSON or other profiles? Ref to support for multiple transport/session bindings?? Compatibility with UMA??] Cost-effective and Easy-to-Use.—XACML is not encountered directly by end-users. Enterprises implementing ABAC with XACML leverage tools available from multiple vendors that implement XACML “under the covers” while presenting user-friendly interfaces to access-policy administrators. There is no licensing cost for use of the XACML specification by tool developers or by implementing enterprises. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Stakeholder communities using proposed standard: | Privacy/Civil Liberties  Usability and Human Factors  Consumer Advocates  US Federal Government  US State, Local, Tribal, and Territorial Government  Research, Development, Education, and Innovation  Identity and Attribute Providers  Interoperability | | IT Infrastructure  Regulated Industries  Small Business, Entrepreneurs  Security  Relying Parties  Unaffiliated Individuals  Other, Please Specify: Health |
| **Required by regulation?** | Yes  No  Unsure | If Yes, click here to list applicable regulations. | |
| **Trust Framework(s) adopted****?** | Yes  No  Unsure | ??? Assuming “trust framework” = “federation” Can we cite anything here? All I can think of off-hand is IC-ITE – USG classified community. How about Healthcare? Any non-US federation implementers??] | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Nominator name: | Martin Smith | Internal IDESG sponsor  *(if applicable)* | IDESG Security Committee |
| Nominator email: | Bfc.mclean@gmail.com | Date of submission: | Click here to enter a date. |

**To be completed by SCC:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SCC Review of Nomination** | | | |
| SCC review completion date: | Click here to enter a date. | **Progress to evaluation?** | Yes  No |
| SCC comments:  *(if not progressing, explain the reason)* | Click here to enter text. | | |

**(Continued on next page)**

**Section B: Evaluation**

**To be completed by evaluator:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Standard Evaluation Criteria | | |
| **Relevance to Identity Ecosystem:** | Click here to enter text. Refer to SAP v2, Section 4.2, item a for guidance. Be sure to cite the IDESG baseline requirements being addressed by this standard. | **Meets:** |
| **No vendor lock-in:** | Click here to enter text. Refer to SAP v2, Section 4.2, item b for guidance. | **Meets:** |
| **Affordability:** | Click here to enter text. Refer to SAP v2, Section 4.2, item c for guidance. | **Meets:** |
| **Compatible with NSTIC Guiding Principles:**  ***(minimum of one)*** | **Standard directly addresses one or more of the NSTIC Guiding Principles:** | |
| **Privacy Enhancing:**  If applicable, click here to enter text. Refer to SAP v2, Section 4.3, item a for guidance. | |
| **Voluntary:**  If applicable, click here to enter text. Refer to SAP v2, Section 4.3, item b for guidance. | |
| **Secure and Resilient:**  If applicable, click here to enter text. Refer to SAP v2, Section 4.3, item c for guidance. | |
| **Interoperable:**  If applicable, click here to enter text. Refer to SAP v2, Section 4.3, item d for guidance. | |
| **Cost Effective:**  If applicable, click here to enter text. Refer to SAP v2, Section 4.3, item e for guidance. | |
| **Easy-to-use:**  If applicable, click here to enter text. Refer to SAP v2, Section 4.3, item f for guidance. | |
| **For NSTIC guiding principles not addressed by the standard,**  **the standard supports and does not work against these NSTIC Guiding Principles:**  If the standard does work against one or more NSTIC Guiding Principles, click here and provide a summary of how. | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluator Recommendation to SCC** | | | | |
| **Evaluator name:** | **Date of submission to SCC:** | **Accept** | **More info needed** | **Reject** |
| Click here to enter text. | Click here to enter a date. |  |  |  |
| **Evaluator comments:**  ***(if not approved, explain the reason for the decision)*** | Click here to enter text. | | | |

**To be completed by SCC:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SCC Review of Evaluation** | | | |
| **SCC review completion date:** | Click here to enter a date. | **Progress to Privacy for privacy review?** | Yes  No |
| **SCC Comments:**  ***(if not progressing, explain the reason)*** | Click here to enter text. | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SCC Recommendation to IDESG Plenary following Privacy Report Review** | | | |
| **SCC Privacy Report review date:** | Click here to enter a date. | **Recommendation to IDESG:** | Adopt  Do not adopt |
| **SCC Comments:**  ***(if recommending to not adopt, explain the reason)*** | Click here to enter text. | | |