

CASSANDRA-900

tzz

2010-03-15

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Root issue CASSANDRA-900</b>	<b>2</b>
1.1	Summary . . . . .	2
1.2	Description . . . . .	2
1.3	Commits . . . . .	2
1.4	Comments . . . . .	2
1.5	Pull requests . . . . .	3

# Chapter 1

## Root issue CASSANDRA-900

### 1.1 Summary

access levels for Thrift authorization

### 1.2 Description

Provide access levels at the API level, set by the login() method relayed through IAuthenticator.

### 1.3 Commits

No related commits

### 1.4 Comments

1. **tzz:** This is a simple patch that will just replace checkLoginDone() with the appropriate access level check throughout CassandraServer. ZERO, READ, INSERT, and ALL access levels are proposed.
2. **tzz:** Passes all tests.
3. **tzz:** SimpleAuthenticator will simply grant ALL access. As discussed in the mailing lists, it won't try to be a comprehensive solution and users should implement the IAuthenticator that makes sense for them.
4. **urandom:** Hey Ted, I have a couple of questions regarding this.
  - \* Can you explain your choice of access levels? In particular, I'm not sure I understand why you'd want both INSERT and ALL, (particularly since the only difference is deletes which you can effectively do through an overwrite).
  - \* Can you explain why you'd want to return an AccessLevel to the client, and why you wouldn't throw the AuthorizationException (assuming that was by choice).
5. **tzz:** I separated an INSERT level for writers that shouldn't be able to delete (logging agents). Overwriting is not the same as deleting: you can only overwrite what you know; deleting can use ranges. This is a necessary use case in my environment.

I considered a DELETE access level too, since as you see INSERT and DELETE are really separate. Perhaps with a separate DELETE, the ALL AccessLevel won't be needed (see below) because it's an OR of READ+INSERT+DELETE.

The client gets back an AccessLevel so they know in advance what they've been authorized to do. Throwing an exception later in the game is still done. It's a single-byte return code, we already store it, and it won't change for the duration of the connection. I don't see the harm in sending it back. The client can just ignore it if they want. We could change the return to an int, though, so we can express "INSERT+DELETE" or "READ+INSERT" numerically without more AccessLevels.

6. **urandom:** I've applied this with some minor changes. Basically I changed the enum members to NONE, READONLY, READWRITE, and FULL in the hope that they better communicate their effect.

Thanks Ted.

7. **hudson:** Integrated in Cassandra #388 (See [<http://hudson.zones.apache.org/hudson/job/Cassandra/388/>]) access levels for Thrift authorization

Patch by Ted Zlatanov and eevans for  
regenerated thrift code to include new enum

Patch by eevans and Ted Zlatanov for

8. **tzz:** Thanks for working on this, Eric.

I forgot to change the API version in cassandra.thrift. This change should probably have bumped the minor rev. WDYT?

9. **urandom:** Actually, since the return type for login() has changed, I'd call that "backward incompatible" and say that the major needs to be incremented.

Good catch, I completely missed this. I'll update it presently.

Thanks Ted.

## 1.5 Pull requests

No pull requests