SCIM WG Discussion SCIM WG

Phil Hunt
August 3, 2012

Directory and SCIM

- Should today's directories evolve to support SCIM?
 - Yes, it seems inevitable
- What might this mean?
 - Current LDAPv3 clients do not need full SCIM schema
 - SCIM could be a new Access Protocol for Directories
 - SCIM+Directory should focus on current SCIM protocol
 - Not an exercise to port LDAPv3 to REST. Use REST!
 - Directories will need to support complex attributes
 - Profile for LDAPv3 limited complex support
 - E.g. use telephonenumber; work to reference a work/home/other
 - Some data may only be visible to SCIM clients
 - No interest in LDAPv4 to support complex attributes
 - Transfer between directories via SCIM for full fidelity

SCIM Path Discussion

- Several things now impacting path URIs
 - Tenancy desire to indicate tenancy using URL (as opposed to a tenancy implied by credential)
 - An account may access one or more tenancies
 - Targeting the ability to reference a specific application type
 - "Users" are too general anyway
 - Object types may expand
 - Ability to query for any object under "/"

SCIM Path Cont'd

- Conclusion: tying object type to a "parent" object may not be that useful though it is common REST practice
 - More often will want to query by extended object type
 - E.g. "WindowsUser" or "CRMuser"
- Suggestion:
 - Require objectIds to be unique
 - Any object can be retrieved modified at "root"
 - Use paths more as broad filters (tenancy/target)
 - Shortcuts: /me points to object associated with current security credential
 - JSON modified so that outer structure defines top-level object type
 - Less confusing when looking at JSON structure on its own

Other Questions

- Ability to Query using POST
 - URL based queries create confidentiality issues (e.g. logs)
 - URL ? params may be subject to injection attacks
- REST "minimum" Profile
- Add & Replace
 - Why not combine in "PUT"
 - Minor difference is resource identifier
- POST
 - Re-work POST to accommodate query and bulk?