

IETF 119
Brisbane
March 2024

Aaron Parecki
David Waite
Philippe De Ryck

OAuth 2.0 for Browser-Based Apps (Best Current Practice)

[https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-ietf-oauth-browser-based-apps/
draft -17](https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-ietf-oauth-browser-based-apps/draft-17)

OAuth 2.0 for Browser Based Apps

- Includes recommendations for implementers building browser-based apps using OAuth 2.0
- "Browser-based apps" are defined as applications executing in a browser, aka "SPA" or "single-page apps", and may include a backend component

Table of Contents Excerpt

5. The Threat of Malicious JavaScript

5.1. Malicious JavaScript Payloads

5.1.1. Single-Execution Token Theft

5.1.2. Persistent Token Theft

5.1.3. Acquisition and Extraction of New Tokens

5.1.4. Proxying Requests via the User's Browser

5.2. Attack Consequences

5.2.1. Exploiting Stolen Refresh Tokens

5.2.2. Exploiting Stolen Access Tokens

5.2.3. Client Hijacking

Table of Contents Excerpt

6. Application Architecture Patterns

6.1. Backend For Frontend (BFF)

6.1.1. Application Architecture

6.1.2. Implementation Details

6.1.3. Security Considerations

6.1.4. Threat Analysis

6.2. Token-Mediating Backend

6.2.1. Application Architecture

6.2.2. Implementation Details

6.2.3. Security Considerations

6.2.4. Threat Analysis

6.3. Browser-based OAuth 2.0 client

6.3.1. Application Architecture

6.3.2. Security Considerations

6.3.3. Threat Analysis

Pattern: Backend for Frontend (BFF)

6.1.4.1. Attack Payloads and Consequences

If the attacker has the ability to execute malicious JavaScript code in the application's execution context, the following payloads become relevant attack scenarios:

- Proxying Requests via the User's Browser (See [Section 5.1.4](#))

Note that this attack scenario results in the following consequences:

- Client Hijacking (See [Section 5.2.3](#))

Pattern: Token-Mediating Backend

6.2.4.1. Attack Payloads and Consequences

If the attacker has the ability to execute malicious JavaScript code in the application's execution context, the following payloads become relevant attack scenarios:

- Single-Execution Token Theft (See [Section 5.1.1](#)) for access tokens
- Persistent Token Theft (See [Section 5.1.2](#)) for access tokens
- Proxying Requests via the User's Browser (See [Section 5.1.4](#))

Note that this attack scenario results in the following consequences:

- Exploiting Stolen Access Tokens (See [Section 5.2.2](#))
- Client Hijacking (See [Section 5.2.3](#))

Pattern: Pure Browser OAuth Client

6.3.3.1. Attack Payloads and Consequences

If the attacker has the ability to execute malicious JavaScript code in the application's execution context, the following payloads become relevant attack scenarios:

- Single-Execution Token Theft (See [Section 5.1.1](#))
- Persistent Token Theft (See [Section 5.1.2](#))
- Acquisition and Extraction of New Tokens (See [Section 5.1.3](#))
- Proxying Requests via the User's Browser (See [Section 5.1.4](#))

The most dangerous payload is the acquisition and extraction of new tokens. In this attack scenario, the attacker only interacts with the authorization server, which makes the actual implementation details of the OAuth functionality in the JavaScript client irrelevant. Even if the legitimate client application finds a perfectly secure token storage mechanism, the attacker will still be able to obtain tokens from the authorization server.

Note that these attack scenarios result in the following consequences:

- Exploiting Stolen Refresh Tokens (See [Section 5.2.1](#))
- Exploiting Stolen Access Tokens (See [Section 5.2.2](#))
- Client Hijacking (See [Section 5.2.3](#))

Changes from -16 to -17

- Applied editorial changes from Filip Skokan's and Louis Jannett's reviews
- Clarification on application of cookie encryption
- Added a security consideration on the use of postMessage referencing Security BCP (thanks to Louis Jannett)

Next Steps

Last call?

<https://www.ietf.org/archive/id/draft-ietf-oauth-browser-based-apps-17.html>