OAuth Working Group
Internet-Draft
Intended status: Standards Track
Expires: September 30, 2013

J. Richer, Ed.
The MITRE Corporation
J. Bradley
Ping Identity
M.B. Jones
Microsoft
M. Machulak
Newcastle University
March 29, 2013

OAuth 2.0 Dynamic Client Registration Protocol
draft-ietf-oauth-dyn-reg-09

Abstract

This specification defines an endpoint and protocol for dynamic registration of OAuth 2.0 Clients at an Authorization Server and methods for the dynamically registered client to manage its registration.

Status of This Memo

This Internet-Draft is submitted in full conformance with the provisions of BCP 78 and BCP 79.

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts. The list of current Internet-Drafts is at http://datatracker.ietf.org/drafts/current/.

Internet-Drafts are draft documents valid for a maximum of six months and may be updated, replaced, or obsoleted by other documents at any time. It is inappropriate to use Internet-Drafts as reference material or to cite them other than as "work in progress."

This Internet-Draft will expire on September 30, 2013.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2013 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

This document is subject to BCP 78 and the IETF Trust's Legal Provisions Relating to IETF Documents (http://trustee.ietf.org/license-info) in effect on the date of publication of this document. Please review these documents carefully, as they describe your rights and restrictions with respect

to this document. Code Components extracted from this document must include Simplified BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the Trust Legal Provisions and are provided without warranty as described in the Simplified BSD License.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction 2
1.1. Notational Conventions 3
1.2. Terminology 3
2. Client Metadata 4
2.1. Relationship Between Grant Types and Response Types . . . 7
2.2. Human Readable Client Metadata 7
3. Client Registration Endpoint 9
3.1. Client Registration Request 9
3.2. Client Registration Response 10
4. Client Configuration Endpoint 10
4.1. Forming the Client Configuration Endpoint URL 11
4.2. Client Read Request 11
4.3. Client Update Request 12
4.4. Client Delete Request 14
5. Responses 15
5.1. Client Information Response 15
5.2. Client Registration Error Response 16
6. IANA Considerations 17
7. Security Considerations 17
8. Normative References 19
Appendix A. Acknowledgments 20
Appendix B. Document History 20
Authors' Addresses 23

1. Introduction

In some use-case scenarios, it is desirable or necessary to allow OAuth 2.0 clients to obtain authorization from an OAuth 2.0 authorization server without requiring the two parties to interact beforehand. Nevertheless, in order for the authorization server to accurately and securely represent to end-users which client is seeking authorization to access the end-user's resources, a method for automatic and unique registration of clients is needed. The OAuth 2.0 authorization framework does not define how the relationship between the Client and the Authorization Server is initialized, or how a given client is assigned a unique Client Identifier. Historically, this has happened out-of-band from the OAuth 2.0 protocol. This draft provides a mechanism for a client to register itself with the Authorization Server, which can be used to dynamically provision a Client Identifier, and optionally a Client Secret.

As part of the registration process, this specification also defines a mechanism for the client to present the Authorization Server with a set of metadata, such as a display name and icon to be presented to the user during the authorization step. This draft also provides a mechanism for the Client to read and update this information after the initial registration action.

1.1. Notational Conventions

The key words 'MUST', 'MUST NOT', 'REQUIRED', 'SHALL', 'SHALL NOT', 'SHOULD', 'SHOULD NOT', 'RECOMMENDED', 'MAY', and 'OPTIONAL' in this document are to be interpreted as described in [RFC2119].

Unless otherwise noted, all the protocol parameter names and values are case sensitive.

1.2. Terminology

This specification uses the terms "Access Token", "Refresh Token", "Authorization Code", "Authorization Grant", "Authorization Server", "Authorization Endpoint", "Client", "Client Identifier", "Client Secret", "Protected Resource", "Resource Owner", "Resource Server", and "Token Endpoint" defined by OAuth 2.0 [RFC6749].

This specification defines the following additional terms:

- Client Registration Endpoint: The OAuth 2.0 Endpoint through which a Client can request new registration. The means of the Client obtaining the URL for this endpoint are out of scope for this specification.

- Client Configuration Endpoint: The OAuth 2.0 Endpoint through which a specific Client can manage its registration information, provided by the Authorization Server to the Client. This URL for this endpoint is communicated to the client by the Authorization Server in the Client Information Response.

- Registration Access Token: An OAuth 2.0 Bearer Token issued by the Authorization Server through the Client Registration Endpoint which is used by the Client to authenticate itself during read, update, and delete operations. This token is associated with a particular Client.

2. Client Metadata

Clients generally have an array of metadata associated with their unique Client Identifier at the Authorization Server. These can range from human-facing display strings, such as a client name, to items that impact the security of the protocol, such as the list of valid redirect URIs.

Extensions and profiles of this specification MAY expand this list, but MUST at least accept all parameters on this list. The Authorization Server MUST ignore any additional parameters sent by the Client that it does not understand.

[[Editor's note: normative language in the table below is meant to apply to the *client* when sending the request. The paragraph above is meant to say that the server must at least accept all parameters and not fail with an error at an unknown parameter, especially if it's in the list below. Also, extensions need to explicitly call out if they're not going to do something with one of these basic parameters instead of just ignoring their existence. This is meant to be the *minimum set* of parameters for interoperability.]]

redirect_uris
: RECOMMENDED. Array of redirect URIs for use in the Authorization Code and Implicit grant types. An Authorization Server SHOULD require registration of valid redirect URIs for all clients that use these grant types in order to protect against token and credential theft attacks.

client_name
: RECOMMENDED. Human-readable name of the Client to be presented to the user. If omitted, the Authorization Server MAY display to the user the raw "client_id" value instead. The value of this field MAY be internationalized as described in Human Readable Client Metadata (Section 2.2).

client_uri
: RECOMMENDED. URL of the homepage of the Client. If present, the server SHOULD display this URL to the end user in a clickable fashion. The value of this field MAY be internationalized as described in Human Readable Client Metadata (Section 2.2).

logo_uri
: OPTIONAL. URL that references a logo for the Client. If present, the server SHOULD display this image to the end user during approval.The value of this field MAY be internationalized as described in Human Readable Client Metadata (Section 2.2).

contacts
: OPTIONAL. Array of email addresses for people responsible for this Client. The Authorization Server MAY make these addresses available to end users for support requests for the Client. An Authorization Server MAY use these email addresses as identifiers for an administrative page for this client.

tos_uri
: OPTIONAL. URL that points to a human-readable Terms of Service for the Client. The Authorization Server SHOULD display this URL to the End-User if it is given. The value of this field MAY be internationalized as described in Human Readable Client Metadata (Section 2.2).

token_endpoint_auth_method
: OPTIONAL. The requested authentication type for the Token Endpoint. Valid values are:

  * "none": this is a public client as defined in OAuth 2.0 and does not have a client secret

  * "client_secret_post": the client uses the HTTP POST parameters defined in OAuth 2.0 section 2.3.1

  * "client_secret_basic": the client uses HTTP Basic defined in OAuth 2.0 section 2.3.1

  * "client_secret_jwt": the client uses the JWT Assertion profile with a symmetric secret issued by the server

  * "private_key_jwt": the client uses the JWT Assertion profile with its own private key

  Other authentication methods may be defined by extension. If unspecified or omitted, the default is "client_secret_basic", denoting HTTP Basic Authentication Scheme as specified in Section 2.3.1 of OAuth 2.0.

scope
: OPTIONAL. Space separated list of scope values (as described in OAuth 2.0 Section 3.3 [RFC6749]) that the client is declaring that it may use when requesting access tokens. If omitted, an Authorization Server MAY register a Client with a default set of scopes.

grant_types
: OPTIONAL. Array of OAuth 2.0 grant types that the Client may use. These grant types are defined as follows:

* "authorization_code": The Authorization Code Grant described in OAuth 2.0 Section 4.1.

* "implicit": The Implicit Grant described in OAuth 2.0 Section 4.2.

* "password": The Resource Owner Password Credentials Grant described in OAuth 2.0 Section 4.3

* "client_credentials": The Client Credentials Grant described in OAuth 2.0 Section 4.4

* "refresh_token": The Refresh Token Grant described in OAuth 2.0 Section 6.

* "urn:ietf:params:oauth:grant-type:jwt-bearer": The JWT Bearer grant type defined in OAuth JWT Bearer Token Profiles [OAuth.JWT].

* "urn:ietf:params:oauth:grant-type:saml2-bearer": The SAML 2 Bearer grant type defined in OAuth SAML 2 Bearer Token Profiles [OAuth.SAML2].

Authorization Servers MAY allow for other values as defined in grant type extensions to OAuth 2.0. The extension process is described in OAuth 2.0 Section 2.5, and the value of this parameter MUST be the same as the value of the "grant_type" parameter passed to the Token Endpoint defined in the extension.

response_types
OPTIONAL. Array of the OAuth 2.0 response types that the Client may use. These response types are defined as follows:

* "code": The Authorization Code response described in OAuth 2.0 Section 4.1.

* "token": The Implicit response described in OAuth 2.0 Section 4.2

Authorization Servers MAY allow for other values as defined in response type extensions to OAuth 2.0. The extension process is described in OAuth 2.0 Section 2.5, and the value of this parameter MUST be the same as the value of the "response_type" parameter passed to the Authorization Endpoint defined in the extension.

policy_uri

OPTIONAL. A URL location that the Client provides to the End-User to read about the how the profile data will be used. The Authorization Server SHOULD display this URL to the End-User if it is given. The value of this field MAY be internationalized as described in Human Readable Client Metadata (Section 2.2).

jwks_uri
OPTIONAL. URL for the Client's JSON Web Key Set [JWK] document that is used for signing requests, such as requests to the Token Endpoint using the "private_key_jwt" assertion client credential. The keys MAY also be used for higher level protocols that require signing or encryption.

2.1. Relationship Between Grant Types and Response Types

The "grant_types" and "response_types" values described above are partially orthogonal, as they refer to arguments passed to different endpoints in the OAuth protocol. However, they are related in that the "grant_types" available to a client influence the "response_types" that the client is allowed to use, and vice versa. For instance, a "grant_types" value that includes "authorization_code" implies a "response_types" value that includes code, as both values are defined as part of the OAuth 2.0 Authorization Code Grant. As such, a server supporting these fields SHOULD take steps to ensure that a client cannot register itself into an inconsistent state.

The correlation between the two fields is listed in the table below.

grant_types value includes:	response_types value includes:
authorization_code	code
implicit	token
password	(none)
client_credentials	(none)
refresh_token	(none)
urn:ietf:params:oauth:grant-type:jwt-bearer	(none)

Extensions and profiles of this document that introduce new values to either the "grant_types" or "response_types" parameter MUST document all correspondences between the parameter types.

2.2. Human Readable Client Metadata

Human-readable Client Metadata values and Client Metadata values that reference human-readable values MAY be represented in multiple languages and scripts. For example, the values of fields such as "client_name", "tos_uri", "policy_uri", "logo_uri", and "client_uri" might have multiple locale-specific values in some Client registrations.

To specify the languages and scripts, BCP47 [RFC5646] language tags are added to Client Metadata member names, delimited by a # character. Since JSON member names are case sensitive, it is RECOMMENDED that language tag values used in Claim Names be spelled using the character case with which they are registered in the IANA Language Subtag Registry [IANA.Language]. In particular, normally language names are spelled with lowercase characters, region names are spelled with uppercase characters, and languages are spelled with mixed case characters. However, since BCP47 language tag values are case insensitive, implementations SHOULD interpret the language tag values supplied in a case insensitive manner. Per the recommendations in BCP47, language tag values used in Metadata member names should only be as specific as necessary. For instance, using "fr" might be sufficient in many contexts, rather than "fr-CA" or "fr-FR".

For example, a Client could represent its name in English as ""client_name#en": "My Client"" and its name in Japanese as ""client_name#ja-Jpan-JP": "クライアント名"" within the same registration request. The Authorization Server MAY display any or all of these names to the Resource Owner during the authorization step, choosing which name to display based on system configuration, user preferences or other factors.

If any human-readable field is sent without a language tag, parties using it MUST NOT make any assumptions about the language, character set, or script of the string value, and the string value MUST be used as-is wherever it is presented in a user interface. To facilitate interoperability, it is RECOMMENDED that clients and servers use a human-readable field without any language tags in addition to any language-specific fields, and it is RECOMMENDED that any human-readable fields sent without language tags contain values suitable for display on a wide variety of systems.

Implementer's Note: Many JSON libraries make it possible to reference members of a JSON object as members of an Object construct in the native programming environment of the library. However, while the "#" character is a valid character inside of a JSON object's member names, it is not a valid character for use in an object member name in many programming environments. Therefore, implementations will

need to use alternative access forms for these claims. For instance, in JavaScript, if one parses the JSON as follows, "var j = JSON.parse(json);", then the member "client_name#en-us" can be accessed using the JavaScript syntax "j["client_name#en-us"]".

3. Client Registration Endpoint

The Client Registration Endpoint is an OAuth 2.0 Endpoint defined in this document that is designed to allow a Client to register itself with the Authorization Server. The Client Registration Endpoint MUST accept HTTP POST messages with request parameters encoded in the entity body using the "application/json" format. The Client Registration Endpoint MUST be protected by a transport-layer security mechanism, and the server MUST support TLS 1.2 RFC 5246 [RFC5246] and /or TLS 1.0 [RFC2246] and MAY support additional transport-layer mechanisms meeting its security requirements. When using TLS, the Client MUST perform a TLS/SSL server certificate check, per RFC 6125 [RFC6125].

The Client Registration Endpoint MAY accept an initial authorization credential in the form of an OAuth 2.0 [RFC6749] access token in order to limit registration to only previously authorized parties. The method by which this access token is obtained by the registrant is generally out-of-band and is out of scope of this specification.

In order to support open registration and facilitate wider interoperability, the Client Registration Endpoint SHOULD allow initial registration requests with no authentication. These requests MAY be rate-limited or otherwise limited to prevent a denial-of-service attack on the Client Registration Endpoint.

In order to facilitate registered clients updating their information, the Client Registration Endpoint issues a Request Access Token for clients to securely identify themselves in future connections to the Client Configuration Endpoint (Section 4). As such, the Client Configuration Endpoint MUST accept requests with OAuth 2.0 Bearer Tokens [RFC6750] for these operations, whether or not the initial registration call requires authentication of some form.

The Client Registration Endpoint MUST ignore all parameters it does not understand.

3.1. Client Registration Request

This operation registers a new Client to the Authorization Server. The Authorization Server assigns this client a unique Client Identifier, optionally assigns a Client Secret, and associates the metadata given in the request with the issued Client Identifier. The

request includes any parameters described in Client Metadata (Section 2) that the client wishes to specify for itself during the registration. The Authorization Server MAY provision default values for any items omitted in the Client Metadata.

The Client sends an HTTP POST to the Client Registration Endpoint with a content type of "application/json". The HTTP Entity Payload is a JSON [RFC4627] document consisting of a JSON object and all parameters as top-level members of that JSON object.

For example, a client could send the following registration request to the Client Registration Endpoint:

Following is a non-normative example request (with line wraps for display purposes only):

```
POST /register HTTP/1.1
Content-Type: application/json
Accept: application/json
Host: server.example.com

{
 "redirect_uris":["https://client.example.org/callback",
    "https://client.example.org/callback2"]
 "client_name":"My Example Client",
 "token_endpoint_auth_method":"client_secret_basic",
 "scope":"read write dolphin",
 "logo_uri":"https://client.example.org/logo.png",
 "jwk_uri":"https://client.example.org/my_rsa_public_key.jwk"
}
```

3.2. Client Registration Response

Upon successful registration, the Authorization Server generates a new Client Identifier for the client. This Client Identifier MUST be unique at the server and MUST NOT be in use by any other client. The server responds with an HTTP 201 Created code and a body of type "application/json" with content described in Client Information Response (Section 5.1).

Upon an unsuccessful registration, the Authorization Server responds with an error as described in Client Registration Error (Section 5.2).

4. Client Configuration Endpoint

The Client Configuration Endpoint is an OAuth 2.0 protected endpoint that is provisioned by the server for a specific client to be able to view and update its registered information. The Client MUST include its Registration Access Token in all calls to this endpoint as an OAuth 2.0 Bearer Token [RFC6750].

Operations on this endpoint are switched through the use of different HTTP methods [RFC2616].

4.1. Forming the Client Configuration Endpoint URL

The Authorization Server MUST provide the client with the fully qualified URL in the "registration_client_uri" element of the Client Information Response (Section 5.1). The Authorization Server MUST NOT expect the client to construct or discover this URL on its own. The Client MUST use the URL as given by the server and MUST NOT construct this URL from component pieces.

Depending on deployment characteristics, the Client Configuration Endpoint URL may take any number of forms. It is RECOMMENDED that this endpoint URL be formed through the use of a server-constructed URL string which combines the Client Registration Endpoint's URL and the issued client_id for this Client, with the latter as either a path parameter or a query parameter. For example, a Client with the Client ID "s6BhdRkqt3" could be given a Client Configuration Endpoint URL of "https://server.example.com/register/s6BhdRkqt3" (path parameter) or of "https://server.example.com/register?client_id=s6BhdRkqt3" (query parameter). In both of these cases, the client simply follows the URL as given.

These common patterns can help the Server to more easily determine the client to which the request pertains, which MUST be matched against the client to which the Registration Access Token was issued. If desired, the server MAY simply return the Client Registration Endpoint URL as the Client Configuration Endpoint URL and change behavior based on the authentication context provided by the Registration Access Token.

4.2. Client Read Request

In order to read the current configuration of the Client on the Authorization Server, the Client makes an HTTP GET request to the Client Configuration Endpoint, authenticating with its Registration Access Token.

Following is a non-normative example request (with line wraps for display purposes only):

```
GET /register/s6BhdRkqt3 HTTP/1.1
Accept: application/json
Host: server.example.com
Authorization: Bearer reg-23410913-abewfq.123483
```

Upon successful read of the information for a currently active Client, the Authorization Server responds with an HTTP 200 OK with content type of "application/json" and a payload as described in Client Information Response (Section 5.1).

If the client does not exist on this server, the server MUST return an HTTP 403 Forbidden.

If the Client does not have permission to read its record, the server MUST return an HTTP 403 Forbidden.

4.3. Client Update Request

This operation updates a previously-registered client with new metadata at the Authorization Server. This request is authenticated by the Registration Access Token issued to the client.

The Client sends an HTTP PUT to the Client Configuration Endpoint with a content type of "application/json". The HTTP Entity Payload is a JSON [RFC4627] document consisting of a JSON object and all parameters as top- level members of that JSON object.

This request MUST include all fields described in Client Metadata (Section 2) as returned to the Client from a previous register, read, or update operation. The Client MUST NOT include the "registration_access_token", "registration_client_uri", "expires_at", or "issued_at" fields described in Client Information Response (Section 5.1).

Valid values of Client Metadata fields in this request MUST replace, not augment, the values previously associated with this Client. Omitted fields MUST be treated as null or empty values by the server.

The Client MUST include its "client_id" field in the request, and it MUST be the same as its currently-issued Client Identifier. If the client includes the "client_secret" field in the request, the value of this field MUST match the currently-issued Client Secret for that Client. The Client MUST NOT be allowed to overwrite its existing Client Secret with its own chosen value.

For all metadata fields, the Authorization Server MAY replace any invalid values with suitable default values, and it MUST return any such fields to the Client in the response.

For example, a client could send the following request to the Client Registration Endpoint to update the client registration in the above example with new information:

Following is a non-normative example request (with line wraps for display purposes only):

```
PUT /register/s6BhdRkqt3 HTTP/1.1
Accept: application/json
Host: server.example.com
Authorization: Bearer reg-23410913-abewfq.123483

{
 "client_id":"s6BhdRkqt3",
 "client_secret": "cf136dc3c1fc93f31185e5885805d",
 "redirect_uris":["https://client.example.org/callback",
    "https://client.example.org/alt"],
 "scope": "read write dolphin",
 "grant_types": ["authorization_code", "refresh_token"]
 "token_endpoint_auth_method": "client_secret_basic",
 "jwk_uri": "https://client.example.org/my_rsa_public_key.jwk"
 "client_name":"My New Example",
 "logo_uri":"https://client.example.org/newlogo.png"
}
```

Upon successful update, the Authorization Server responds with an HTTP 200 OK Message with content type "application/json" and a payload as described in Client Information Response (Section 5.1). The Authorization Server MAY include a new Client Secret and/or Registration Access Token in its response. If so, the Client MUST immediately discard its previous Client Secret and/or Registration Access Token.

If the Client does not exist on this server, the server MUST return an HTTP 403 Forbidden.

If the Client is not allowed to update its records, the server MUST respond with HTTP 403 Forbidden.

If the Client attempts to set an invalid metadata field and the Authorization Server does not set a default value, the Authorization Server responds with an error as described in Client Registration Error Response (Section 5.2).

4.4. Client Delete Request

[[Editor's note: The utility and nature of this function are still under active discussion. This is a proposed set of functionality that a server MAY choose to implement, else give a 405 response to any client that tries, if it can't support it.]]

In order to deprovision itself on the Authorization Server, the Client makes an HTTP DELETE request to the Client Configuration Endpoint. This request is authenticated by the Registration Access Token issued to the client.

Following is a non-normative example request (with line wraps for display purposes only):

```
DELETE /register/s6BhdRkqt3 HTTP/1.1
Accept: application/json
Host: server.example.com
Authorization: Bearer reg-23410913-abewfq.123483
```

A successful delete action will invalidate the client_id, client_secret, and registration_access_token for this client, thereby preventing the client_id from being used at either the Authorization Endpoint or Token Endpoint of the Authorization Server. The Authorization Server SHOULD immediately invalidate all existing authorization grants and currently-active tokens associated with this Client.

If a Client has been successfully deprovisioned, the Authorization Server responds with an HTTP 204 No Content message.

If there is no such client, the server responds with an HTTP 403 Forbidden.

If the client is not allowed to delete itself, the server responds with HTTP 403 Forbidden.

If the server does not support the delete method, it responds with an HTTP 405 Not Supported.

Following is a non-normative example response:

```
HTTP/1.1 204 No Content
Cache-Control: no-store
Pragma: no-cache
```

5. Responses

In response to certain requests from the Client to either the Client Registration Endpoint or the Client Configuration Endpoint as described in this specification, the Authorization Server sends the following response bodies.

5.1. Client Information Response

The response contains the Client Identifier as well as the Client Secret, if the Client is a confidential Client. The response also contains the fully qualified URL to the Client Configuration Endpoint for this specific client that the client may use to obtain and update information about itself. The response also contains a Registration Access Token that is to be used by the client to perform subsequent operations at the Client Configuration Endpoint.

client_id
: REQUIRED. The unique Client identifier, MUST NOT be currently valid for any other registered Client.

client_secret
: OPTIONAL. The Client secret. If issued, this MUST be unique for each "client_id". This value is used by confidential clients to authenticate to the Token Endpoint as described in OAuth 2.0 Section 2.3.1.

expires_at
: REQUIRED if "client_secret" is issued. The number of seconds from 1970-01-01T0:0:0Z as measured in UTC that the "client_secret" will expire or "0" if it does not expire. See RFC 3339 [RFC3339] for details regarding date/times in general and UTC in particular.

issued_at
: OPTIONAL. Specifies the timestamp when the Client Identifier was issued. The timestamp value MUST be a positive integer. The value is expressed in the number of seconds since January 1, 1970 00:00:00 GMT.

registration_access_token

REQUIRED. The Access token to be used by the client to perform actions on the Client Configuration Endpoint.

registration_client_uri
REQUIRED. The fully qualified URL of the Client Configuration Endpoint for this client. The Client MUST use this URL as given when communicating with the Client Configuration Endpoint.

Additionally, the Authorization Server MUST return all registered metadata (Section 2) about this client, including any fields provisioned by the Authorization Server itself. The Authorization Server MAY reject or replace any of the client's requested metadata values submitted during the registration or update requests and substitute them with suitable values.

The response is an "application/json" document with all parameters as top-level members of a JSON object [RFC4627].

Following is a non-normative example response:

```
HTTP/1.1 200 OK
Content-Type: application/json
Cache-Control: no-store
Pragma: no-cache

{
 "registration_access_token": "reg-23410913-abewfq.123483",
 "registration_client_uri":
       "https://server.example.com/register/s6BhdRkqt3",
 "client_id":"s6BhdRkqt3",
 "client_secret": "cf136dc3c1fc93f31185e5885805d",
 "expires_at":2893276800
 "redirect_uris":["https://client.example.org/callback",
    "https://client.example.org/callback2"]
 "scope": "read write dolphin",
 "grant_types": ["authorization_code", "refresh_token"]
 "token_endpoint_auth_method": "client_secret_basic",
 "logo_uri": "https://client.example.org/logo.png",
 "jwk_uri": "https://client.example.org/my_rsa_public_key.jwk"
}
```

5.2. Client Registration Error Response

When an OAuth 2.0 error condition occurs, such as the client presenting an invalid Registration Access Token, the Authorization Server returns an Error Response as defined in Section 5.2 of the OAuth 2.0 specification.

When a registration error condition occurs, the Authorization Server returns an HTTP 400 status code with content type "application/json" consisting of a JSON object [RFC4627] describing the error in the response body.

The JSON object contains two members:

error
: The error code, a single ASCII string.

error_description
: A human-readable text description of the error for debugging.

This specification defines the following error codes:

invalid_redirect_uri
: The value of one or more "redirect_uris" is invalid.

invalid_client_metadata
: The value of one of the client metadata (Section 2) fields is invalid and the server has rejected this request. Note that an Authorization server MAY choose to substitute a valid value for any requested parameter of a client's metadata.

invalid_client_id
: Value of "client_id" is invalid.

Following is a non-normative example of an error response (with line wraps for display purposes only):

```
HTTP/1.1 400 Bad Request
Content-Type: application/json
Cache-Control: no-store
Pragma: no-cache

{
 "error":"invalid_redirect_uri",
 "error_description":"The redirect URI of http://sketchy.example.com
   is not allowed for this server."
}
```

6. IANA Considerations

This document makes no requests of IANA.

7. Security Considerations

Since requests to the Client Registration Endpoint result in the transmission of clear-text credentials (in the HTTP request and response), the server MUST require the use of a transport-layer security mechanism when sending requests to the Registration Endpoint. The server MUST support TLS 1.2 RFC 5246 [RFC5246] and/or TLS 1.0 [RFC2246] and MAY support additional transport-layer mechanisms meeting its security requirements. When using TLS, the Client MUST perform a TLS/SSL server certificate check, per RFC 6125 [RFC6125].

As this endpoint is an OAuth 2.0 Protected Resource, requests to the Registration Endpoint SHOULD have some rate limiting on failures to prevent the Registration Access Token from being disclosed though repeated access attempts.

The authorization server MUST treat all client metadata as self-asserted. A rogue Client might use the name and logo for the legitimate Client, which it is trying to impersonate. An Authorization Server needs to take steps to mitigate this phishing risk, since the logo could confuse users into thinking they're logging in to the legitimate Client. For instance, an Authorization Server could warn if the domain/site of the logo doesn't match the domain/site of redirect URIs. An Authorization Server can also present warning messages to end users about untrusted Clients in all cases, especially if such clients have been dynamically registered and have not been trusted by any users at the Authorization Server before.

In a situation where the Authorization Server is supporting open Client registration, it must be extremely careful with any URL provided by the Client that will be displayed to the user (e.g. "logo_uri" and "policy_uri"). A rogue Client could specify a registration request with a reference to a drive-by download in the "policy_uri". The Authorization Server should check to see if the "logo_uri" and "policy_uri" have the same host as the hosts defined in the array of "redirect_uris".

While the Client Secret can expire, the Registration Access Token should not expire while a client is still actively registered. If this token were to expire, a Client could be left in a situation where it has no means of updating itself and must register itself anew. As the Registration Access Tokens are long-term credentials, and since the Registration Access Token is a Bearer token and acts as the sole authentication for use at the Client Configuration Endpoint, it MUST be protected by the Client as described in OAuth 2.0 Bearer [RFC6750].

If a Client is deprovisioned from a server, any outstanding Registration Access Tokens for that client MUST be invalidated at the same time. Otherwise, this can lead to an inconsistent state wherein a Client could make requests to the Client Configuration Endpoint where the authentication would succeed but the action would fail because the Client is no longer valid.

8. Normative References

[IANA.Language]
Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA), "Language Subtag Registry", 2005.

[JWK] Jones, M.B., "JSON Web Key (JWK)", May 2012.

[OAuth.JWT]
Jones, M.B., Campbell, B., and C. Mortimore, "JSON Web Token (JWT) Bearer Token Profiles for OAuth 2.0", draft-ietf-oauth-jwt-bearer (work in progress), December 2012.

[OAuth.SAML2]
Campbell, B. and C. Mortimore, "SAML 2.0 Bearer Assertion Profiles for OAuth 2.0", draft-ietf-oauth-saml2-bearer (work in progress), November 2012.

[RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", BCP 14, RFC 2119, March 1997.

[RFC2246] Dierks, T. and C. Allen, "The TLS Protocol Version 1.0", RFC 2246, January 1999.

[RFC2616] Fielding, R., Gettys, J., Mogul, J., Frystyk, H., Masinter, L., Leach, P., and T. Berners-Lee, "Hypertext Transfer Protocol -- HTTP/1.1", RFC 2616, June 1999.

[RFC3339] Klyne, G., Ed. and C. Newman, "Date and Time on the Internet: Timestamps", RFC 3339, July 2002.

[RFC4627] Crockford, D., "The application/json Media Type for JavaScript Object Notation (JSON)", RFC 4627, July 2006.

[RFC5246] Dierks, T. and E. Rescorla, "The Transport Layer Security (TLS) Protocol Version 1.2", RFC 5246, August 2008.

[RFC5646] Phillips, A. and M. Davis, "Tags for Identifying Languages", BCP 47, RFC 5646, September 2009.

[RFC6125] Saint-Andre, P. and J. Hodges, "Representation and Verification of Domain-Based Application Service Identity within Internet Public Key Infrastructure Using X.509 (PKIX) Certificates in the Context of Transport Layer Security (TLS)", RFC 6125, March 2011.

[RFC6749] Hardt, D., "The OAuth 2.0 Authorization Framework", RFC 6749, October 2012.

[RFC6750] Jones, M. and D. Hardt, "The OAuth 2.0 Authorization Framework: Bearer Token Usage", RFC 6750, October 2012.

Appendix A. Acknowledgments

The authors thank the OAuth Working Group, the User-Managed Access Working Group, and the OpenID Connect Working Group participants for their input to this document. In particular, the following individuals have been instrumental in their review and contribution to various versions of this document: Amanda Anganes, Tim Bray, Domenico Catalano, George Fletcher, Torsten Lodderstedt, Eve Maler, Thomas Hardjono, Nat Sakimura, and Christian Scholz.

Appendix B. Document History

[[to be removed by the RFC editor before publication as an RFC]]

-09

- Added method of internationalization for Client Metadata values
- Fixed SAML reference

-08

- Collapsed jwk_uri, jwk_encryption_uri, x509_uri, and x509_encryption_uri into a single jwks_uri parameter
- Renamed grant_type to grant_types since it's a plural value
- Formalized name of "OAuth 2.0" throughout document
- Added JWT Bearer Assertion and SAML 2 Bearer Assertion to example grant types
- Added response_types parameter and explanatory text on its use with and relationship to grant_types

-07

- Changed registration_access_url to registration_client_uri
- Fixed missing text in 5.1
- Added Pragma: no-cache to examples
- Changed "no such client" error to 403
- Renamed Client Registration Access Endpoint to Client Configuration Endpoint
- Changed all the parameter names containing "_url" to instead use "_uri"
- Updated example text for forming Client Configuration Endpoint URL

-06

- Removed secret_rotation as a client-initiated action, including removing client secret rotation endpoint and parameters.
- Changed _links structure to single value registration_access_url.
- Collapsed create/update/read responses into client info response.
- Changed return code of create action to 201.
- Added section to describe suggested generation and composition of Client Registration Access URL.
- Added clarifying text to PUT and POST requests to specify JSON in the body.
- Added Editor's Note to DELETE operation about its inclusion.
- Added Editor's Note to registration_access_url about alternate syntax proposals.

-05

- changed redirect_uri and contact to lists instead of space delimited strings
- removed operation parameter
- added _links structure
- made client update management more RESTful

- split endpoint into three parts
- changed input to JSON from form-encoded
- added READ and DELETE operations
- removed Requirements section
- changed token_endpoint_auth_type back to token_endpoint_auth_method to match OIDC who changed to match us

-04

- removed default_acr, too undefined in the general OAuth2 case
- removed default_max_auth_age, since there's no mechanism for supplying a non-default max_auth_age in OAuth2
- clarified signing and encryption URLs
- changed token_endpoint_auth_method to token_endpoint_auth_type to match OIDC

-03

- added scope and grant_type claims
- fixed various typos and changed wording for better clarity
- endpoint now returns the full set of client information
- operations on client_update allow for three actions on metadata: leave existing value, clear existing value, replace existing value with new value

-02

- Reorganized contributors and references
- Moved OAuth references to RFC
- Reorganized model/protocol sections for clarity
- Changed terminology to "client register" instead of "client associate"
- Specified that client_id must match across all subsequent requests

- Fixed RFC2XML formatting, especially on lists

-01

- Merged UMA and OpenID Connect registrations into a single document
- Changed to form-paramter inputs to endpoint
- Removed pull-based registration

-00

- Imported original UMA draft specification

Authors' Addresses

Justin Richer (editor)
The MITRE Corporation

Email: jricher@mitre.org

John Bradley
Ping Identity

Email: ve7jtb@ve7jtb.com

Michael B. Jones
Microsoft

Email: mbj@microsoft.com

Maciej Machulak
Newcastle University

Email: m.p.machulak@ncl.ac.uk
URI: http://ncl.ac.uk/