

# IETF Registration Discussion

Nov 4, 2013

OAuth WG

# Three 1/2 Proposals

- Dynamic Registration 14
  - Stateful + Every client is potentially different
  - on hold
- Dynamic Core + Dynamic Mgmt
- Stateless OAuth Client
- Client Association + Software Statement + optional mgmt API
  - Clients grouped in classes (software statement)
  - 3 registration types
  - Stateless by default

# Preferences Phil/Tony

- All Mgmt Proposals on hold for now
  - Including SCIM and Dyn Mgmt and any others
  - Purpose not clear
  - What is the interop issue?
- Merge dyn-core and client-association
  - Software Statement is included?
  - Implied optional approval model ( software classes)
  - Decide on Dyn Token issuance model
    - 4.5 extension token swap model or new endpoint\* (see next slide)
  - 3 association types
    - Static / Dynamic / Transient
    - Need strong / simple categorization for client developers
  - What is appropriate pre-amble?
- Software statement
  - Keep registration time options to absolute minimum
  - Can be generated by anyone (instance, developer, trusted 3<sup>rd</sup> party, publisher, root authority)
    - Use developer signed in short term until API publishers set up developer sites
  - where should metadata be defined? In statement draft or registration?
  - current thinking was meta data should be in statement unless it MUST be specified at registration time (e.g. redirect URL)

# 4.5 Token Extension Discussion

- Leverage existing endpoint for registration
  - Also impacts ActAs proposal, HOK, other hybrids
  - Precedence is OpenID Connect
- Issue: Non-normative text suggests only access tokens
- Advantage: As new token types (and client credential tokens) are defined, registration can automatically support
- Disadvantage: Some want to keep registration apart from access processing
  - Not really a protocol issue
  - How generic is the token endpoint?
- Does this MATTER? Why?