

DEFECT REPORT FORM

1. Defect Report Number: 224

Title: The evaluation of a filter to UNDEFINED needs to be made consistent for the case where access control is/is not present.
2. Source: UK
3. Addressed to: ISO/IEC/JTC1/SC6/WG7 and ITU-T Study Group VII
4. (a) WG Secretariat: UK (BSI)
(b) ITU-T WP: WP4 SG7
5. Date Circulated by WG Secretariat:
6. Deadline for Response from Editor:
7. Defect Report Concerning:
ISO/IEC 9594-3
8. Qualifier: (e.g. error, omission, clarification required)
Inconsistency - clarification required
9. References in Document: (e.g. page, clause/section, figure, and/or table numbers)
Clause 7.8.2
10. Nature of Defect: (complete, concise explanation of the perceived problem)

The third paragraph confuses the two concepts of the assertion being defined or not and of the **filterItem** *evaluating* to UNDEFINED. It specifies (correctly) the conditions under which the assertion is defined (before being tested against entries), but does not specify that a value assertion (as opposed to a presence assertion) should also return UNDEFINED for an entry that does not contain a specific attribute.

Note that it is inconsistent that a filter item on a value an attribute type A should be evaluated differently for an entry that does not contain A:
 0. Depending on whether or not access control is present (see Figure B.9, where the evaluation in the presence of access control is made explicitly (and correctly) to UNDEFINED)
 1. Depending on whether or not at any specific moment an attribute type is known by the evaluating mechanism (see 3rd para of 7.8.2)It is therefore logical that a value assertion must also return UNDEFINED for an entry not containing the specified attribute, even in the absence of access control.
11. Solution Proposed by the Source: (optional)

In subclause 7.8.1, change undefined to UNDEFINED in all places to indicate

subclause.

In subclause 7.8.2, modify NOTE 1, and add a new paragraph after the notes.:

(Para 3) Any assertion about the values _ for the indicated matching rules.

NOTE 1 — When the assertion specified by a **FilterItem** is not defined, the **FilterItem** shall *evaluate* to the logical value UNDEFINED. It may also evaluate to UNDEFINED under other circumstances (e.g. in the presence of access control or as defined below).

NOTE 2 — Access control restrictions may affect the evaluation of the **FilterItem**.

An assertion which is defined by these conditions additionally *evaluates* to UNDEFINED if it relates to an attribute value and the attribute type is not present in an attribute against which the assertion is being tested. An assertion which is defined by these conditions and relates to the presence of an attribute type evaluates to FALSE.

Attribute value assertions in filter items are evaluated _

12 Editor's Response: