

Re: Stored Procedures and Security

Source:

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/SQL-Server/microsoft.public.sqlserver.programming/2004-07/4472.html>

From: Scott Meddows (*scott_meddows_no_spm_at_tsged-removeme.com*)

Date: 07/20/04

Date: Tue, 20 Jul 2004 09:52:14 -0500

I think that's my problem. We are just starting to really become a med sized IT dept (still relatively new) and different databases are owned by different people (In fact, database owner isn't even assigned in one of the databases!). Many of the problems occur when you have to cross over to different catalogs.

Thanks a lot, Wex!! I think you solved my problem.

"Wex" <anonymous@discussions.microsoft.com> wrote in message news:090301c46e67\$26b353f0\$a601280a@phx.gbl...

> *You are mostly correct in your assumption. The one*
> *exception is what is called "Chain of Ownership." In*
> *short, one owner cannot grant access to something that is*
> *owned by another person. If all the objects (views and*
> *stored procedures in this case) are owned by the same user*
> *(dbo is suggested) then all you have to do is grant exec*
> *rights. If different users own the view and procedure,*
> *you will have to take the additional steps of adding the*
> *select etc permissions.*
> >-----Original Message-----
> >Okay, another big question (This one is probably more
> specific to my SQL Server instance :)). It was always
> my understanding that
> >SPs are a great way to wrap up SQL commands without
> having to give security everywhere in the DB. The
> problem that I have is that
> >I cannot only give EXEC permissions to a login on my SQL
> box but I have to give select permissions and update
> permissions and all
> >other sorts of permissions to the connected user for all
> the SELECT and UPDATE commands that are executed in the SP!
> >
> >Shouldn't I just have to give EXEC to the SP and be done
> with it?
> >
> >Are there some settings that change this?
> >

> >*Thanks*

> >*Scott*

> >

> >

> >.

> >