Securing the Service

Ah, security. You knew we’d get here eventually. Security is one of those areas in the architecture that can become wildly complex before you know it. People are counting on you to get it right, with no margin for error. Lawsuits happen and companies end up on the front page, or completely go under, when security is implemented poorly. You simply can’t afford to mess it up!

Fortunately, because we are dealing with a RESTful service that is anchored on HTTP, we can leverage widely-used security mechanisms (some of which have been in place for years) for the more complicated and risky parts of the security architecture. In this chapter, we will highlight some of those mechanisms as we add security to our task-management service. Along the way, we'll also highlight some useful design approaches and ASP.NET Web API features that, though not intrinsically tied to security, seem to fit well in the context of this subject.

# The Main Idea

In chapter 5 we implemented a scenario where the user created a task. In this chapter, we are going to return to that scenario and add security to it. We are also going to implement a few more scenarios so that we can more fully illustrate the design and implementation of security in the context of a service built using ASP.NET Web API. Table 6-1 summarizes the service scenarios we will cover in this chapter, including the authorization level required of the user:

Table 6-1. Scenarios Used to Illustrate Security

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Scenario | Required User Role |
| Create a task | Manager |
| Activate, complete, or reactivate a task | Senior Worker |
| Get a task | Junior Worker |

Before we go any farther, though, let's agree upon some basic terminology:

* User: The end user of the task-management service. May or may not be an actual human being. We will refer to the user as "he" just for simplicity.
* Caller: The application that invokes the task-management service on behalf of the user (e.g., a browser). Fiddler was the caller in Chapter 5.

Now that we've agreed upon that terminology, let’s get things started by breaking the security of the service into two parts: authentication and authorization. Authentication answers the question, “Is the user of the API service who he claims to be?” And authorization answers the question, “Is the user allowed to do what he is trying to do?” In other words, authentication establishes the user's identity, and authorization enforces the user's permissions.

## Authentication

The first thing the service must do when it receives a new web request is verify the user's claim of identity. We do this by validating the credentials supplied by the user. Via these credentials, the caller must provide two basic pieces of information: who the user claims to be, and how that claim can be verified.

Within the world of HTTP, there are several ways to validate a user's credentials. Table 6-2 lists the more prevalent ones.

Table 6-2. Types of Authentication in HTTP

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Type | Description |
| None | You don’t need to know the identity of the user, nor do you need to protect any of the site’s or service’s resources by applying permissions. |
| Basic | The caller adds an HTTP authorization header containing a username and password. Those values are essentially plaintext, using only base64 encoding for simple obfuscation.  This generally requires SSL transport security (i.e., an endpoint that exposes an HTTPS address) to protect the plaintext username and password. |
| Digest | Provides a fancier method of putting the username and password in the HTTP header that provides encryption for those values. This is intended to avoid the need for HTTPS. |
| Kerberos | Uses an authentication server, such as Windows Active Directory, to provide integrated and seemless credential validation. This would be similar to intranet sites on Windows networks that integrate with the domain for user authentication. A lot of internal SharePoint sites use this approach so that a company’s users don’t have to re-enter their username and password when they visit the intranet. |
| Public-key, Certificates | Relies on caller-provided certificates to identify a user. This is not very useful in a public web site or service, but it is very appropriate for applications where the users or devices are known. An example of this approach might be an internal, portable, device-based warehousing application for tracking inventory. Or maybe a set of iPads used by the sales team. The group of users is relatively small and well-defined within a company’s organizational structure. Each user or device is issued a certificate that identifies him (or it) on every call to your site or service. |
| Tokens | Largely used when third-party token issuers are involved (e.g., OpenID, OAuth). This relieves your service of the burden of verifying a user’s credentials.  Here's how it works(generally speaking):  The caller first verifies the username and password using a token issuer that your service trusts. Upon successful verification, the token issuer provides the caller with a token. Once the caller has that token, it uses it to call your service. Since your service trusts the issuer that the caller used for credential verification, your service can trust that the token securely identifies the user, and it therefore doesn't have to bother with verifying the user’s credentials itself. |

In selecting authentication types to support for the task-management service, we can definitely skip the None option because we actually need to identify the caller and enforce permissions.

We can also eliminate Kerberos and Certificates, because the goal is to keep our examples simple and avoid relying on Active Directory. These particular approaches can be overly complex and impractical when dealing with public-facing Internet applications and services.

Between Basic and Digest, Basic is much easier to implement. With Basic authentication, the service application and its callers only have to deal with plain-text credentials. Basic authentication is actually fairly common, and it is viable even in production environments… provided that transport security is used to protect the credentials. Therefore, we will support Basic authentication in the task-management service. However, SSL transport security configuration is a separate topic, outside the scope of this book. We trust that if you decide to implement Basic authentication on your own ASP.NET Web API services, you will enable suport for HTTPS.

Finally, we will also support a form of token-based security in the task-management service, as token-based security has become so common these days that it is impossible to ignore (e.g., you've probably heard of OpenID and/or OAuth). It's also a lot easier to implement than it was just a few years ago, thanks to increasing standardization and availability of open-source libraries. Speaking of which, we'll use one of our own libraries to make implementing token-based security as painless as possible.

## Authorization

Once the service has securely identified the user, it needs to enforce some basic permissions. The task-management service will have three levels of users, as indicated in Table 6-1.

These days, the concept of claims has finally caught on. The main idea is to associate a list of key-value string pairs with an authenticated user, where the key-value pairs provide all kinds of information about the user. This information includes things the user is claiming to have or to be able to do, roles the user is claiming to belong to, and so on. And because a specific type of claim can support more than one instance, the structure can be used for assigning roles. For example, Table 6-3 demonstrates what a set of claims for “Bob” might look like. Note that the Role claim type has more than one value (i.e., Bob belongs to more than one role).

Figure 6-3. An Example User’s Claims

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Claim type | Example claim value |
| Email | [bob@gmail.com](mailto:bob@gmail.com) |
| UserId | BSmith |
| Surname | Smith |
| Givenname | Bob |
| SID | Bob’s security identifier; usually something issued by the system:  C73832EE-3191-4DC7-A3D4-25ADDDD5496B |
| Role | Manager |
| Role | Senior Worker |

Strictly speaking, claims aren’t limited to values dealing only with authorization. They do, however, provide a nice structure for indicating the roles a user belongs to, which is of primary interest when it comes to authorization.

## Overview of the Authentication and Authorization Process

Before we start coding, let's take a high-level look at what's involved in the authentication and authorization process. Each time a request comes into the task-management service, the following things happen (in this order):

1. A web request arrives that includes an HTTP authorization header containing information about the user, and how that information can be verified.
2. The service verifies the user information. Note, however, in the case of token-based authentication, the trusted token isssuer has already verified the user information; all the service needs to do is verify that the token was actually issued by the trusted token issuer.
3. The service sets up a security principal object on the current HTTP context that contains the current user’s identity and associated claims (e.g., userId, email, firstname, lastname, and roles). Each web request executes in its own HTTP context, so each request will execute within the context of the user's principal.
4. All "downstream" code checks the current context's principal to determine if/how processing is allowed to continue. If processing is not allowed to continue, then the service will communicate this to the caller via a response message containing the appropriate HTTP status code (i.e., 401 - Unauthorized).

Now let's get into the implementation so that we can see all of this in action!

# Securing the POST

We implemented the TasksController class' AddTask action method in Chapter 5, but we did it without securing it in any way. Let's return to that method and get some security around it…

## The Authorization Filter

Let's secure AddTask by adding the Authorize attribute (i.e., an "authorization filter") to it as follows. Be sure to use the Web API version of the attribute (found in the System.Web.Http namespace), and not the MVC version. Note that we are using the attribute to specify that the user must have a manager role:

[Route("", Name = "AddTaskRoute")]

[HttpPost]

[Authorize(Roles = Constants.RoleNames.Manager)]

public IHttpActionResult AddTask(HttpRequestMessage requestMessage, NewTask newTask)

{

var task = \_addTaskMaintenanceProcessor.AddTask(newTask);

var result = new TaskCreatedActionResult(requestMessage, task);

return result;

}

Now, we'll repeat the POST demo from Chapter 5, just to see if anything has changed:

POST Request (abbreviated)

POST http://localhost:61589/api/v1/tasks HTTP/1.1

Content-Type: text/json

{"Subject":"Fix something important"}

You should see the following response:

POST Response (abbreviated)

HTTP/1.1 401 Unauthorized

Content-Type: text/json; charset=utf-8

{"Message":"Authorization has been denied for this request."}

Isn't that great? We have secured the POST by simply applying an attribute to the appropriate controller action method! But why was this so easy? The reason is because ASP.NET Web API is doing the heavy lifting for us. First, the framework's message processing infrastructure detects the presence of the Authorize action filter attribute on the AddTask method. This causes it to ensure that a security principal containing a manager role has been established on the current HTTP context before invoking the action method. The framework rightly detects that there is no such principal available, and therefore, without ever invoking the target AddTask method, it creates an error response (complete with the correct HTTP status code), which it returns to the caller.

So now we've secured our action method, but these POST requests will always fail until 1) they contain information necessary to establish a principal with the manager role, and 2) until we implement the code that actually uses that information to build a principal and associate it with the current context. Let's address this next…

## A Message Handler to Support HTTP Basic Authentication

If you review the simplified ASP.NET Web API processing pipeline diagram from the previous chapter (Figure 5-1), you'll notice that message handlers are invoked before filters and controller actions. This makes message handlers well suited to take on the responsibility of building a principal and associating it with the current context. Remember, the principal must be established on the current context before the authorization filter is hit, or else the request will be rejected.

Before we implement our message handler (this first one will support Basic authentication), we need to add the security service to which it delegates some of its principal-building responsibilities. Therefore, add the following types:

IBasicSecurityService Interface

namespace WebApi2Book.Web.Api.Security

{

public interface IBasicSecurityService

{

bool SetPrincipal(string username, string password);

}

}

BasicSecurityService Class

using System.Security.Claims;

using System.Security.Principal;

using System.Threading;

using System.Web;

using log4net;

using NHibernate;

using WebApi2Book.Common;

using WebApi2Book.Common.Logging;

using WebApi2Book.Data.Entities;

using WebApi2Book.Web.Common;

namespace WebApi2Book.Web.Api.Security

{

public class BasicSecurityService : IBasicSecurityService

{

private readonly ILog \_log;

public BasicSecurityService(ILogManager logManager)

{

\_log = logManager.GetLog(typeof(BasicSecurityService));

}

public virtual ISession Session

{

get { return WebContainerManager.Get<ISession>(); }

}

/// <summary>

/// An over-simplified method to validate the credentials and set the principal.

/// </summary>

/// <param name="username">The username.</param>

/// <param name="password">Ignored in this implementation.</param>

/// <returns>true if the user was found; otherwise, false</returns>

public bool SetPrincipal(string username, string password)

{

var user = GetUser(username);

IPrincipal principal = null;

if (user == null || (principal = GetPrincipal(user)) == null)

{

\_log.DebugFormat("System could not validate user {0}", username);

return false;

}

Thread.CurrentPrincipal = principal;

if (HttpContext.Current != null)

{

HttpContext.Current.User = principal;

}

return true;

}

public virtual IPrincipal GetPrincipal(User user)

{

var identity = new GenericIdentity(user.Username, Constants.SchemeTypes.Basic);

identity.AddClaim(new Claim(ClaimTypes.GivenName, user.Firstname));

identity.AddClaim(new Claim(ClaimTypes.Surname, user.Lastname));

var username = user.Username.ToLowerInvariant();

switch (username)

{

case "bhogg":

identity.AddClaim(new Claim(ClaimTypes.Role, Constants.RoleNames.Manager));

identity.AddClaim(new Claim(ClaimTypes.Role, Constants.RoleNames.SeniorWorker));

identity.AddClaim(new Claim(ClaimTypes.Role, Constants.RoleNames.JuniorWorker));

break;

case "jbob":

identity.AddClaim(new Claim(ClaimTypes.Role, Constants.RoleNames.SeniorWorker));

identity.AddClaim(new Claim(ClaimTypes.Role, Constants.RoleNames.JuniorWorker));

break;

case "jdoe":

identity.AddClaim(new Claim(ClaimTypes.Role, Constants.RoleNames.JuniorWorker));

break;

default:

return null;

}

return new ClaimsPrincipal(identity);

}

public virtual User GetUser(string username)

{

username = username.ToLowerInvariant();

return

Session.QueryOver<User>().Where(x => x.Username == username).SingleOrDefault();

}

}

}

Then wire this up so it can be used as a dependency. This is done by adding the following to the NinjectConfigurator AddBindings method:

container.Bind<IBasicSecurityService>().To<BasicSecurityService>().InSingletonScope();

Let's review. The first thing to note in this security service is that the ISession dependency is not constructor-injected. This is because the BasicSecurityService is constructed in the application's startup sequence, before the application has prepared an ISession instance (we'll see this when we configure the message handler). The Session property provides the BasicSecurityService with "lazy" access to the ISession managed by the Ninject container; by the time it accesses it, the ISession is available as a dependency. On a related note, the fact that the BasicSecurityService stores no state itself (other than the ILog instance, which is safe for multithread access) allows us to configure it as a singleton, as you can see in the code snippet above.

The next method, SetPrincipal, uses the GetPrincipal method to construct a security principal. If a valid principal can be constructed, it associates the principal with the current thread. This is mostly for legacy purposes; e.g., by convention, some 3rd party libraries look for a principal on the current thread. More importantly, however, SetPrincipal also places the principal on the current HttpContext. This is vitally important to do in ASP.NET Web API applications, because while multiple threads may be used to process a single request (and therefore some threads may not automatically have access to the principal via Thread.CurrentPrincipal), the current HttpContext, and the principal associated with it, will be - and will need to be - accessable throughout an entire call. Fortunately, NuGet security packages for Web API, including the one we're going to use later for token-based security, typically take care of this important detail.

The last method, GetPrincipal, is an extremely simplified approach to constructing a principal from user credentials. In this case, we're only using part of the user's credential, username (used to fetch the User); we're not even validating the password. Why is this so incredibly simplified? Well, because at this level we're dealing with concerns not unique to ASP.NET Web API. Verifying user credentials at this level should be concerns of a credential management and verification package, like ASP.NET Membership (used the previous edition of this book), or ASP.NET Identity (which is Microsoft's latest approach to membership). As our focus is on ASP.NET Web API, not credential management and validation, we will move on to our custom handler that demonstrates how to wire up any authentication logic. Go ahead and implement the handler now as follows:

using System;

using System.Net;

using System.Net.Http;

using System.Net.Http.Headers;

using System.Text;

using System.Threading;

using System.Threading.Tasks;

using System.Web;

using log4net;

using WebApi2Book.Common;

using WebApi2Book.Common.Logging;

namespace WebApi2Book.Web.Api.Security

{

public class BasicAuthenticationMessageHandler : DelegatingHandler

{

public const char AuthorizationHeaderSeparator = ':';

private const int UsernameIndex = 0;

private const int PasswordIndex = 1;

private const int ExpectedCredentialCount = 2;

private readonly ILog \_log;

private readonly IBasicSecurityService \_basicSecurityService;

public BasicAuthenticationMessageHandler(ILogManager logManager, IBasicSecurityService basicSecurityService)

{

\_basicSecurityService = basicSecurityService;

\_log = logManager.GetLog(typeof (BasicAuthenticationMessageHandler));

}

protected override async Task<HttpResponseMessage> SendAsync(

HttpRequestMessage request,

CancellationToken cancellationToken)

{

if (HttpContext.Current.User.Identity.IsAuthenticated)

{

\_log.Debug("Already authenticated; passing on to next handler...");

return await base.SendAsync(request, cancellationToken);

}

if (!CanHandleAuthentication(request))

{

\_log.Debug("Not a basic auth request; passing on to next handler...");

return await base.SendAsync(request, cancellationToken);

}

bool isAuthenticated;

try

{

isAuthenticated = Authenticate(request);

}

catch (Exception e)

{

\_log.Error("Failure in auth processing", e);

return CreateUnauthorizedResponse();

}

if (isAuthenticated)

{

var response = await base.SendAsync(request, cancellationToken);

return response.StatusCode == HttpStatusCode.Unauthorized ? CreateUnauthorizedResponse() : response;

}

return CreateUnauthorizedResponse();

}

public bool CanHandleAuthentication(HttpRequestMessage request)

{

return (request.Headers != null

&& request.Headers.Authorization != null

&& request.Headers.Authorization.Scheme.ToLowerInvariant() == Constants.SchemeTypes.Basic);

}

public bool Authenticate(HttpRequestMessage request)

{

\_log.Debug("Attempting to authenticate...");

var authHeader = request.Headers.Authorization;

if (authHeader == null)

{

return false;

}

var credentials = GetCredentialParts(authHeader);

if (credentials.Length != ExpectedCredentialCount)

{

return false;

}

return \_basicSecurityService.SetPrincipal(credentials[UsernameIndex], credentials[PasswordIndex]);

}

public string[] GetCredentialParts(AuthenticationHeaderValue authHeader)

{

var encodedCredentials = authHeader.Parameter;

var credentialBytes = Convert.FromBase64String(encodedCredentials);

var credentials = Encoding.ASCII.GetString(credentialBytes);

var credentialParts = credentials.Split(AuthorizationHeaderSeparator);

return credentialParts;

}

public HttpResponseMessage CreateUnauthorizedResponse()

{

var response = new HttpResponseMessage(HttpStatusCode.Unauthorized);

response.Headers.WwwAuthenticate.Add(new AuthenticationHeaderValue(Constants.SchemeTypes.Basic));

return response;

}

}

}

The first thing to note is that BasicAuthenticationMessageHandler derives from DelegatingHandler, an ASP.NET Web API base class. The handler overrides the SendAsync method. This allows it to pass a request to the next handler in the ASP.NET Web API processing pipeline, in cases where processing is allowed to continue, by calling base.SendAsync. It also allows it to return an error response, in cases where processing is not allowed to continue, by calling CreateUnauthorizedResponse.

Next, let's take a look at the following code, which is executed if the user was successfully authenticated:

var response = await base.SendAsync(request, cancellationToken);

return response.StatusCode == HttpStatusCode.Unauthorized ?

CreateUnauthorizedResponse() : response;

The first line passes processing along to the next handler and waits for the response. The next line analyzes the response and modifies it if the response indicates that the request was unauthorized (e.g., if the user is not in a manager role in our Create a Task scenario). It modifies the response by using the CreateUnauthorizedResponse method.

The value added by CreateUnauthorizedResponse is seen in the second line of the method, where it adds the Basic scheme to the response's WwwAuthenticate header. A response with the Unauthorized (401) HTTP status code together with the Basic scheme in the header will trigger most browsers to prompt for Username and Password.

The rest of the methods are also fairly straightforward:

* CanHandleAuthentication examines the request and returns true if it contains an HTTP header indicating the Basic authorization scheme.
* Authenticate uses GetCredentials to extract the credentials from the request, and then it delegates off to the security service we implemented earlier to do the actual work of setting the principal.
* GetCredentials parses the credentials from the request. The thing to remember here is that the credentials arrive base64-encoded and separated by a delimiter (":").

Now that we've implemented the handler, the last step is to configure it to be added to the application’s message handler pipeline. This is configured during application startup, so let's return to the WebApiApplication class and modify it so that it appears as follows:

using System.Web;

using System.Web.Http;

using WebApi2Book.Common.Logging;

using WebApi2Book.Common.TypeMapping;

using WebApi2Book.Web.Api.Security;

using WebApi2Book.Web.Common;

namespace WebApi2Book.Web.Api

{

public class WebApiApplication : HttpApplication

{

protected void Application\_Start()

{

GlobalConfiguration.Configure(WebApiConfig.Register);

RegisterHandlers();

new AutoMapperConfigurator().Configure(WebContainerManager.GetAll<IAutoMapperTypeConfigurator>());

}

private void RegisterHandlers()

{

var logManager = WebContainerManager.Get<ILogManager>();

GlobalConfiguration.Configuration.MessageHandlers.Add(

new BasicAuthenticationMessageHandler(logManager,

WebContainerManager.Get<IBasicSecurityService>()));

}

}

}

Note the new method, RegisterHandlers. We're going to be adding more handlers later, so we figured it would be good to break this configuration out into a separate method. Looking at the implementation, this adds the handler to the MessageHandlers collection of the Web API global configuration object, and with this in place, all requests to the task-management service will be intercepted by the BasicAuthenticationMessageHandler. For requests decorated with the Basic scheme, the handler will verify the user's credentials and setup a corresponding principal using the trivial implementation in the BasicSecurityService. To prove that all of this is working properly, let's now revisit the demo and see this in action!

First, we need to add the Basic authentication information to the request message. Here we see the encoded information for "bhogg", who, as you may recall from the BasicSecurityService implementation, is a manager. Note the second line; "YmhvZ2c6aWdub3JlZA==" represents bhogg's base64-encoded credentials:

POST Request - Manager (abbreviated)

POST http://localhost:61589/api/v1/tasks HTTP/1.1

Authorization: Basic YmhvZ2c6aWdub3JlZA==

Content-Type: text/json

{"Subject":"Fix something important"}

Now we'll send the request (we're using Fiddler) and examine the response:

POST Response - Manager (abbreviated)

HTTP/1.1 201 Created

Content-Type: text/json; charset=utf-8

{"TaskId":17,"Subject":"Fix something important","StartDate":null,"DueDate":null,"CreatedDate":"2014-05-10T19:02:52.2408621Z","CompletedDate":null,"Status":{"StatusId":1,"Name":"Not Started","Ordinal":0},"Assignees":[],"Links":[{"Rel":"self","Href":"http://localhost:61589/api/v1/tasks/17","Method":"GET"}]}

Excellent! Our credentials for manager "bhogg" have been accepted. We've created a task, only this time we've done it securely. Let's make sure the security we've put in place is actually working by sending another request, this time with the credentials of a user in a junior worker role. This request should be denied, as the AddTask controller action requires the user be in the Manager role. Note, "amRvZTppZ25vcmVk" represents the credentials for "jdoe", the junior worker:

POST Request - Junior Worker (abbreviated)

POST http://localhost:61589/api/v1/tasks HTTP/1.1

Authorization: Basic amRvZTppZ25vcmVk

Content-Type: text/json

{"Subject":"Fix something important"}

POST Response - Junior Worker (abbreviated)

HTTP/1.1 401 Unauthorized

WWW-Authenticate: basic

Perfect. This demonstrates that we have secured our Add a Task scenario; only managers can create a task in our task-management service. The next thing we'll do is implement the remaining scenarios from Table 6-1 leveraging the security infrastructure we've put in place. After that, we'll show how we can add on support for token-based security… without having to modify any of our existing code! This is due to ASP.NET Web API's excellent extensibility support around message handlers.

# Securing Non-Resource API Operations

In Chapter 3 we designed the API for non-resource API operations. The design is summarized in Table 3-4. What's missing from the design is the security aspect, so let's extend the design now by taking security into account:

Table 6-4. A List of Task Status Operations

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| URI | Verb | Description | Security |
| /api/tasks/123/activations | POST | Starts, or "activates", a task; returns the updated task in the response | Requires Senior Worker role |
| /api/tasks/123/completions | POST | Completes a task; returns the updated task in the response | Requires Senior Worker role |
| /api/tasks/123/reactivations | POST | Reopens, or "re-activates", a task; returns the updated task in the response | Requires Senior Worker role; all reactivations will be audited |

## Activate a Task

With that as an introduction, let's by start adding support to activate a task. We'll follow our usual bottom-up approach of adding dependencies first, and the first dependency we'll add is a query processor. Note that the ITaskByIdQueryProcessor interface is in the WebApi2Book.Data project, while its implementation is in the WebApi2Book.Data.SqlServer project (within the QueryProcessors folder).

ITaskByIdQueryProcessor Interface

using WebApi2Book.Data.Entities;

namespace WebApi2Book.Data

{

public interface ITaskByIdQueryProcessor

{

Task GetTask(long taskId);

}

}

TaskByIdQueryProcessor Class

using NHibernate;

using WebApi2Book.Data.Entities;

namespace WebApi2Book.Data.SqlServer.QueryProcessors

{

public class TaskByIdQueryProcessor : ITaskByIdQueryProcessor

{

private readonly ISession \_session;

public TaskByIdQueryProcessor(ISession session)

{

\_session = session;

}

public Task GetTask(long taskId)

{

var task = \_session.Get<Task>(taskId);

return task;

}

}

}

Dependency Configuration (add to bottom of NinjectConfigurator.AddBindings)

container.Bind<ITaskByIdQueryProcessor>().To<TaskByIdQueryProcessor>().InRequestScope();

We introduced the concept of using query processors back in Chapter 5. Basically, query processors are part of a Strategy Pattern implementation to provide access to persistent data. The TaskByIdQueryProcessor implementation is fairly trivial, performing a simple get against the database by taskId.

Our next dependency to add is also a query processor. The query processor we just added is responsible for fetching data, but this one is responsible for updating data. Implement as follows:

IUpdateTaskStatusQueryProcessor Interface

using WebApi2Book.Data.Entities;

namespace WebApi2Book.Data

{

public interface IUpdateTaskStatusQueryProcessor

{

void UpdateTaskStatus(Task taskToUpdate, string statusName);

}

}

UpdateTaskStatusQueryProcessor Class

using NHibernate;

using WebApi2Book.Data.Entities;

namespace WebApi2Book.Data.SqlServer.QueryProcessors

{

public class UpdateTaskStatusQueryProcessor : IUpdateTaskStatusQueryProcessor

{

private readonly ISession \_session;

public UpdateTaskStatusQueryProcessor(ISession session)

{

\_session = session;

}

public void UpdateTaskStatus(Task taskToUpdate, string statusName)

{

var status = \_session.QueryOver<Status>().Where(x => x.Name == statusName).SingleOrDefault();

taskToUpdate.Status = status;

\_session.SaveOrUpdate(taskToUpdate);

}

}

}

Dependency Configuration (add to bottom of NinjectConfigurator.AddBindings)

container.Bind<IUpdateTaskStatusQueryProcessor>().To<UpdateTaskStatusQueryProcessor>().InRequestScope();

The UpdateTaskStatusQueryProcessor implementation is similarly unremarkable. It's just finding the appropriate status object and associating it with the task.

The next dependency is slightly more interesting. It performs all of the "business logic" required to activate a task. That is, the logic that will leverage the query processors we've built. Implement it as follows:

IStartTaskWorkflowProcessor Interface

using WebApi2Book.Web.Api.Models;

namespace WebApi2Book.Web.Api.MaintenanceProcessing

{

public interface IStartTaskWorkflowProcessor

{

Task StartTask(long taskId);

}

}

StartTaskWorkflowProcessor Class

using WebApi2Book.Common;

using WebApi2Book.Common.TypeMapping;

using WebApi2Book.Data.Exceptions;

using WebApi2Book.Data.SqlServer.QueryProcessors;

using WebApi2Book.Web.Api.Models;

namespace WebApi2Book.Web.Api.MaintenanceProcessing

{

public class StartTaskWorkflowProcessor : IStartTaskWorkflowProcessor

{

private readonly IAutoMapper \_autoMapper;

private readonly ITaskByIdQueryProcessor \_taskByIdQueryProcessor;

private readonly IDateTime \_dateTime;

private readonly IUpdateTaskStatusQueryProcessor \_updateTaskStatusQueryProcessor;

public StartTaskWorkflowProcessor(ITaskByIdQueryProcessor taskByIdQueryProcessor,

IUpdateTaskStatusQueryProcessor updateTaskStatusQueryProcessor, IAutoMapper autoMapper,

IDateTime dateTime)

{

\_taskByIdQueryProcessor = taskByIdQueryProcessor;

\_updateTaskStatusQueryProcessor = updateTaskStatusQueryProcessor;

\_autoMapper = autoMapper;

\_dateTime = dateTime;

}

public Task StartTask(long taskId)

{

var taskEntity = \_taskByIdQueryProcessor.GetTask(taskId);

if (taskEntity == null)

{

throw new RootObjectNotFoundException("Task not found");

}

// Simulate some workflow logic...

if (taskEntity.Status.Name != "Not Started")

{

throw new BusinessRuleViolationException("Incorrect task status. Expected status of 'Not Started'.");

}

taskEntity.StartDate = \_dateTime.UtcNow;

\_updateTaskStatusQueryProcessor.UpdateTaskStatus(taskEntity, "In Progress");

var task = \_autoMapper.Map<Task>(taskEntity);

return task;

}

}

}

Dependency Configuration (add to bottom of NinjectConfigurator.AddBindings)

container.Bind<IStartTaskWorkflowProcessor>().To<StartTaskWorkflowProcessor>().InRequestScope();

We'll explain this next, but first we have to add one more dependency to satisfy the compiler: BusinessRuleViolationException. Instances of this trivial exception type are thrown to indicate an attempted violation of the "business logic". Implement as follows:

BusinessRuleViolationException Class

using System;

namespace WebApi2Book.Common

{

public class BusinessRuleViolationException : Exception

{

public BusinessRuleViolationException(string incorrectTaskStatus) : base(incorrectTaskStatus)

{

}

}

}

Now that we've made the compiler happy, let's review the StartTaskWorkflowProcessor class' StartTask method. It begins by delegating to ITaskByIdQueryProcessor to find a Task entity with the specified taskId. An instance of the RootObjectNotFoundException class, which was introduced in Chapter 5, is thrown if no such Task can be found.

Next, we encounter some "business workflow" logic, enforcing a business rule requiring a task to have a status of Not Started in order to be activated. If that condition is satisfied, the ITaskByIdQueryProcessor sets the task's StartDate, and then delegates the job of actually updating the Status to the IUpdateTaskStatusQueryProcessor. Lastly, the indjected IAutoMapper dependency converts the task from an entity representation to a service model representation, which is then returned to the invoker of the StartTask method.

And now it's finally time to implement that invoker of the StartTask method, which is the TaskWorkflowController. (Remember, these are "conceptual resources" as we discussed in Chapter 3, which is why this method is not on the TasksController). Implement as follows:

using System.Web.Http;

using WebApi2Book.Common;

using WebApi2Book.Web.Api.MaintenanceProcessing;

using WebApi2Book.Web.Api.Models;

using WebApi2Book.Web.Common;

using WebApi2Book.Web.Common.Routing;

namespace WebApi2Book.Web.Api.Controllers.V1

{

[ApiVersion1RoutePrefix("")]

[UnitOfWorkActionFilter]

public class TaskWorkflowController : ApiController

{

private readonly IStartTaskWorkflowProcessor \_startTaskWorkflowProcessor;

public TaskWorkflowController(IStartTaskWorkflowProcessor startTaskWorkflowProcessor)

{

\_startTaskWorkflowProcessor = startTaskWorkflowProcessor;

}

[Authorize(Roles = Constants.RoleNames.SeniorWorker)]

[Route("tasks/{taskId:long}/activations", Name = "StartTaskRoute")]

public Task StartTask(long taskId)

{

var task = \_startTaskWorkflowProcessor.StartTask(taskId);

return task;

}

}

}

And that's it; we have implemented the ability to activate a task! Note that we've leveraged several attributes with this implementation. However, we've discussed all of these before, so we will press onward. Before we can rightly claim victory and move onto the next scenario, though, we should prove that what we've implemented actually works. We'll send the following request to activate task #17, which we created at the end of the previous section. Note that we're providing bhogg's credentials to ensure that the request is authorized (he's got a senior worker role):

Activate Task Request (abbreviated)

POST http://localhost:61589/api/v1/tasks/17/activations HTTP/1.1

Authorization: Basic YmhvZ2c6aWdub3JlZA==

Activate Task Response (abbreviated)

HTTP/1.1 200 OK

Content-Type: application/json; charset=utf-8

{"TaskId":17,"Subject":"Fix something important","StartDate":"2014-05-13T00:52:34.2373052Z","DueDate":null,"CreatedDate":"2014-05-10T19:02:52","CompletedDate":null,"Status":{"StatusId":2,"Name":"In Progress","Ordinal":1},"Assignees":[],"Links":[]}

This is correct so far. The task is now In Progress, and we have a non-null value for StartDate. Now let's test our business logic requiring tasks to have a Not Started status in order to be activated. To do so, send the request again… and the result is:

HTTP/1.1 500 Internal Server Error

Content-Type: application/json; charset=utf-8

{"Message":"Incorrect task status. Expected status of 'Not Started'."}

Well, the message looks okay, but the status code is incorrect. We should be returning a status code of 402 to indicate a custom business rule violation, not 500, which indicates a server error. Fortunately, we have the GlobalExceptionHandler, and this status code translation is a perfect job for it. Add the highlighted code to its Handle method, and then retry the request:

…

if (exception is ChildObjectNotFoundException)

{

context.Result = new SimpleErrorResult(context.Request, HttpStatusCode.Conflict, exception.Message);

return;

}

if (exception is BusinessRuleViolationException)

{

context.Result = new SimpleErrorResult(context.Request, HttpStatusCode.PaymentRequired,

exception.Message);

return;

}

context.Result = new SimpleErrorResult(context.Request, HttpStatusCode.InternalServerError,

exception.Message);

…

You should see something similar to the following:

HTTP/1.1 402 Payment Required

Content-Type: application/json; charset=utf-8

{"Message":"Incorrect task status. Expected status of 'Not Started'."}

This is exactly what we wanted to see! Now we can rightly claim victory and move onto the next scenario.

## Complete a Task

This section will go quickly, because we've already implemented most of the dependencies we need to complete a task. The first, and only, new dependency we need to add is ICompleteTaskWorkflowProcessor. Go ahead and implement it now:

ICompleteTaskWorkflowProcessor Interface

using WebApi2Book.Web.Api.Models;

namespace WebApi2Book.Web.Api.MaintenanceProcessing

{

public interface ICompleteTaskWorkflowProcessor

{

Task CompleteTask(long taskId);

}

}

CompleteTaskWorkflowProcessor Class

using WebApi2Book.Common;

using WebApi2Book.Common.TypeMapping;

using WebApi2Book.Data.Exceptions;

using WebApi2Book.Data.SqlServer.QueryProcessors;

using WebApi2Book.Web.Api.Models;

namespace WebApi2Book.Web.Api.MaintenanceProcessing

{

public class CompleteTaskWorkflowProcessor : ICompleteTaskWorkflowProcessor

{

private readonly IAutoMapper \_autoMapper;

private readonly ITaskByIdQueryProcessor \_taskByIdQueryProcessor;

private readonly IDateTime \_dateTime;

private readonly IUpdateTaskStatusQueryProcessor \_updateTaskStatusQueryProcessor;

public CompleteTaskWorkflowProcessor(ITaskByIdQueryProcessor taskByIdQueryProcessor,

IUpdateTaskStatusQueryProcessor updateTaskStatusQueryProcessor, IAutoMapper autoMapper,

IDateTime dateTime)

{

\_taskByIdQueryProcessor = taskByIdQueryProcessor;

\_updateTaskStatusQueryProcessor = updateTaskStatusQueryProcessor;

\_autoMapper = autoMapper;

\_dateTime = dateTime;

}

public Task CompleteTask(long taskId)

{

var taskEntity = \_taskByIdQueryProcessor.GetTask(taskId);

if (taskEntity == null)

{

throw new RootObjectNotFoundException("Task not found");

}

// Simulate some workflow logic...

if (taskEntity.Status.Name != "In Progress")

{

throw new BusinessRuleViolationException("Incorrect task status. Expected status of 'In Progress'.");

}

taskEntity.CompletedDate = \_dateTime.UtcNow;

\_updateTaskStatusQueryProcessor.UpdateTaskStatus(taskEntity, "Completed");

var task = \_autoMapper.Map<Task>(taskEntity);

return task;

}

}

}

Dependency Configuration (add to bottom of NinjectConfigurator.AddBindings)

container.Bind<ICompleteTaskWorkflowProcessor>().To<CompleteTaskWorkflowProcessor>().InRequestScope();

This class is similar to the StartTaskWorkflowProcessor, only this time we are requiring a status of In Progress in order to complete the processing, and we are updating the task's CompletedDate rather than the StartDate.

Now, let's hook it up to the controller, which should appear as follows:

using System.Web.Http;

using WebApi2Book.Common;

using WebApi2Book.Web.Api.MaintenanceProcessing;

using WebApi2Book.Web.Api.Models;

using WebApi2Book.Web.Common;

using WebApi2Book.Web.Common.Routing;

namespace WebApi2Book.Web.Api.Controllers.V1

{

[ApiVersion1RoutePrefix("")]

[UnitOfWorkActionFilter]

[Authorize(Roles = Constants.RoleNames.SeniorWorker)]

public class TaskWorkflowController : ApiController

{

private readonly IStartTaskWorkflowProcessor \_startTaskWorkflowProcessor;

private readonly ICompleteTaskWorkflowProcessor \_completeTaskWorkflowProcessor;

public TaskWorkflowController(IStartTaskWorkflowProcessor startTaskWorkflowProcessor,

ICompleteTaskWorkflowProcessor completeTaskWorkflowProcessor)

{

\_startTaskWorkflowProcessor = startTaskWorkflowProcessor;

\_completeTaskWorkflowProcessor = completeTaskWorkflowProcessor;

}

[Route("tasks/{taskId:long}/activations", Name = "StartTaskRoute")]

public Task StartTask(long taskId)

{

var task = \_startTaskWorkflowProcessor.StartTask(taskId);

return task;

}

[Route("tasks/{taskId:long}/completions", Name = "CompleteTaskRoute")]

public Task CompleteTask(long taskId)

{

var task = \_completeTaskWorkflowProcessor.CompleteTask(taskId);

return task;

}

}

}

As you can see, the controller is still quite simple. However, note that we've moved the Authorize attribute from the StartTask method and placed it on the controller class itself. As a result, we've broadened its scope if influence. Instead of restricting StartTask to users with a senior worker role, it is now requiring a senior worker role for every action method in the controller. This is exactly what we want, and it sure cuts down on clutter that would otherwise be introduced by copy|paste. We could even apply the Authorize attribute at the global configuration level - ASP.NET Web API supports this kind of global application of attributes - but we won't because it doesn't meet our security requirements from a "business" perspective. Still, it's good to know the capability exists.

Before wrappping up this section, let's send a couple of requests to ensure everything is working properly. First, let's close task #17:

Complete Task Request (abbreviated)

POST http://localhost:61589/api/v1/tasks/17/completions HTTP/1.1

Authorization: Basic YmhvZ2c6aWdub3JlZA==

Complete Task Response (abbreviated)

HTTP/1.1 200 OK

Content-Type: application/json; charset=utf-8

{"TaskId":17,"Subject":"Fix something important","StartDate":"2014-05-13T00:52:34","DueDate":null,"CreatedDate":"2014-05-10T19:02:52","CompletedDate":"2014-05-13T02:13:08.9855782Z","Status":{"StatusId":3,"Name":"Completed","Ordinal":2},"Assignees":[],"Links":[]}

So far so good. We see the Status and CompletedDate are being assigned properly. Now let's retry the message so that we can see if our business rule is being enforced:

HTTP/1.1 402 Payment Required

Content-Type: application/json; charset=utf-8

{"Message":"Incorrect task status. Expected status of 'In Progress'."}

It is, indeed! Just what we wanted to see. Now onto the final scenario in this section…

## Reactivate a Task

This section will be much like the previous one. We'll throw in a little twist, though: in this section we're going to audit task reactivations using a custom async filter. With the release of ASP.NET Web API 2.1, async filter implementation is greatly simplified because the framework now provides virtual On\*Async methods to override. We'll show just how simple it is… after we implement the controller method.

The first dependency we need to add is IReactivateTaskWorkflowProcessor. Go ahead and implement it now:

IReactivateTaskWorkflowProcessor Interface

using WebApi2Book.Web.Api.Models;

namespace WebApi2Book.Web.Api.MaintenanceProcessing

{

public interface IReactivateTaskWorkflowProcessor

{

Task ReactivateTask(long taskId);

}

}

ReactivateTaskWorkflowProcessor Class

using WebApi2Book.Common;

using WebApi2Book.Common.TypeMapping;

using WebApi2Book.Data.Exceptions;

using WebApi2Book.Data.SqlServer.QueryProcessors;

using WebApi2Book.Web.Api.Models;

namespace WebApi2Book.Web.Api.MaintenanceProcessing

{

public class ReactivateTaskWorkflowProcessor : IReactivateTaskWorkflowProcessor

{

private readonly IAutoMapper \_autoMapper;

private readonly ITaskByIdQueryProcessor \_taskByIdQueryProcessor;

private readonly IUpdateTaskStatusQueryProcessor \_updateTaskStatusQueryProcessor;

public ReactivateTaskWorkflowProcessor(ITaskByIdQueryProcessor taskByIdQueryProcessor,

IUpdateTaskStatusQueryProcessor updateTaskStatusQueryProcessor, IAutoMapper autoMapper)

{

\_taskByIdQueryProcessor = taskByIdQueryProcessor;

\_updateTaskStatusQueryProcessor = updateTaskStatusQueryProcessor;

\_autoMapper = autoMapper;

}

public Task ReactivateTask(long taskId)

{

var taskEntity = \_taskByIdQueryProcessor.GetTask(taskId);

if (taskEntity == null)

{

throw new RootObjectNotFoundException("Task not found");

}

// Simulate some workflow logic...

if (taskEntity.Status.Name != "Completed")

{

throw new BusinessRuleViolationException("Incorrect task status. Expected status of 'Completed'.");

}

taskEntity.CompletedDate = null;

\_updateTaskStatusQueryProcessor.UpdateTaskStatus(taskEntity, "In Progress");

var task = \_autoMapper.Map<Task>(taskEntity);

return task;

}

}

}

Dependency Configuration (add to bottom of NinjectConfigurator.AddBindings)

container.Bind<IReactivateTaskWorkflowProcessor>().To<ReactivateTaskWorkflowProcessor>().InRequestScope();

This class is similar to the CompleteTaskWorkflowProcessor, only this time we are requiring a status of Completed in order to complete the processing, and we are updating the task's CompletedDate by resetting it to null.

Now, let's hook it up to the controller, which should appear as follows:

using System.Web.Http;

using WebApi2Book.Common;

using WebApi2Book.Web.Api.MaintenanceProcessing;

using WebApi2Book.Web.Api.Models;

using WebApi2Book.Web.Common;

using WebApi2Book.Web.Common.Routing;

namespace WebApi2Book.Web.Api.Controllers.V1

{

[ApiVersion1RoutePrefix("")]

[UnitOfWorkActionFilter]

[Authorize(Roles = Constants.RoleNames.SeniorWorker)]

public class TaskWorkflowController : ApiController

{

private readonly IStartTaskWorkflowProcessor \_startTaskWorkflowProcessor;

private readonly ICompleteTaskWorkflowProcessor \_completeTaskWorkflowProcessor;

private readonly IReactivateTaskWorkflowProcessor \_reactivateTaskWorkflowProcessor;

public TaskWorkflowController(IStartTaskWorkflowProcessor startTaskWorkflowProcessor,

ICompleteTaskWorkflowProcessor completeTaskWorkflowProcessor,

IReactivateTaskWorkflowProcessor reactivateTaskWorkflowProcessor)

{

\_startTaskWorkflowProcessor = startTaskWorkflowProcessor;

\_completeTaskWorkflowProcessor = completeTaskWorkflowProcessor;

\_reactivateTaskWorkflowProcessor = reactivateTaskWorkflowProcessor;

}

[Route("tasks/{taskId:long}/activations", Name = "StartTaskRoute")]

public Task StartTask(long taskId)

{

var task = \_startTaskWorkflowProcessor.StartTask(taskId);

return task;

}

[Route("tasks/{taskId:long}/completions", Name = "CompleteTaskRoute")]

public Task CompleteTask(long taskId)

{

var task = \_completeTaskWorkflowProcessor.CompleteTask(taskId);

return task;

}

[Route("tasks/{taskId:long}/reactivations", Name = "ReactivateTaskRoute")]

public Task ReactivateTask(long taskId)

{

var task = \_reactivateTaskWorkflowProcessor.ReactivateTask(taskId);

return task;

}

}

}

Again, the controller is still quite simple. Let's send a couple of requests to ensure everything is working properly. First, let's reactivate task #17 using bhogg's credentials:

Reactivate Task Request (abbreviated)

POST http://localhost:61589/api/v1/tasks/17/reactivations HTTP/1.1

Authorization: Basic YmhvZ2c6aWdub3JlZA==

Reactivate Task Response (abbreviated)

HTTP/1.1 200 OK

Content-Type: application/json; charset=utf-8

{"TaskId":17,"Subject":"Fix something important","StartDate":"2014-05-13T00:52:34","DueDate":null,"CreatedDate":"2014-05-10T19:02:52","CompletedDate":null,"Status":{"StatusId":2,"Name":"In Progress","Ordinal":1},"Assignees":[],"Links":[]}

So far so good. We see the Status and CompletedDate are being updated properly. Now let's retry the message so that we can see if our business rule is being enforced:

HTTP/1.1 402 Payment Required

Content-Type: application/json; charset=utf-8

{"Message":"Incorrect task status. Expected status of 'Completed'."}

Perfect! It's not allowing us to reactivate a task that is already active, and the response looks correct. So now let's get to the auditing. The first thing to do is implement the custom attribute (implement it as follows):

using System.Threading;

using System.Threading.Tasks;

using System.Web.Http.Controllers;

using System.Web.Http.Filters;

using log4net;

using WebApi2Book.Common.Logging;

using WebApi2Book.Common.Security;

namespace WebApi2Book.Web.Common.Security

{

public class UserAuditAttribute : ActionFilterAttribute

{

private readonly ILog \_log;

private readonly IUserSession \_userSession;

public UserAuditAttribute()

: this(WebContainerManager.Get<ILogManager>(), WebContainerManager.Get<IUserSession>())

{

}

public UserAuditAttribute(ILogManager logManager, IUserSession userSession)

{

\_userSession = userSession;

\_log = logManager.GetLog(typeof (UserAuditAttribute));

}

public override bool AllowMultiple

{

get { return false; }

}

public override Task OnActionExecutingAsync(HttpActionContext actionContext, CancellationToken cancellationToken)

{

\_log.Debug("Starting execution...");

var userName = \_userSession.Username;

return Task.Run(() => AuditCurrentUser(userName), cancellationToken);

}

public void AuditCurrentUser(string username)

{

// Simulate long auditing process

\_log.InfoFormat("Action being executed by user={0}", username);

Thread.Sleep(3000);

}

public override void OnActionExecuted(HttpActionExecutedContext actionExecutedContext)

{

\_log.InfoFormat("Action executed by user={0}", \_userSession.Username);

}

}

}

And now apply the attribute to the controller's ReactivateTask method:

[UserAudit]

[Route("tasks/{taskId:long}/reactivations", Name = "ReactivateTaskRoute")]

public Task ReactivateTask(long taskId)

{

var task = \_reactivateTaskWorkflowProcessor.ReactivateTask(taskId);

return task;

}

Although most of its implementation consists of writing debug messages and sleeping, this attribute demonstrates the ability to do something useful in terms of security; specifically, the ability to non-invasively audit user actions. By simply applying this attribute to a controller action method, or to an entire controller, or even to the global configuration, we have added auditing.

The attribute's implementation is straightforward, with a couple of items to note: First, in an actual production application you should be writing auditing information to a database, not to a log file. Second, notice how we capture the username in OnActionExecutingAsync, prior to performing the actual audit. This is because the HttpContext.Current.User that our IUserSession implementation relies upon is not defined in AuditCurrentUser, so we need to capture any HttpContext.Current.User data that we require and pass it into AuditCurrentUser.

Now let's see the auditing attribute in action. At this point task #17 needs to be "completed" before we can reactivate it. So go ahead and send a completion request to get it into the correct state for reactivating:

POST http://localhost:61589/api/v1/tasks/17/completions HTTP/1.1

Authorization: Basic YmhvZ2c6aWdub3JlZA==

Assuming this was successful, send a request to reactivate the task:

POST http://localhost:61589/api/v1/tasks/17/reactivations HTTP/1.1

Authorization: Basic YmhvZ2c6aWdub3JlZA==

Nothing new to see here; you should have received a response similar to the response from the first reactivation, above. But now let's look in the application's log file to verify that we are, indeed, auditing the reactivation. Amidst the many lines of SimpleTraceWriter-generated information, you should see something similar to the following:

2014-05-13 12:52:38,990 DEBUG [81] WebApi2Book.Web.Common.Security.UserAuditAttribute - Starting execution...

2014-05-13 12:52:38,990 INFO [82] WebApi2Book.Web.Common.Security.UserAuditAttribute - Action being executed by user=bhogg

2014-05-13 12:52:42,068 INFO [82] WebApi2Book.Web.Common.Security.UserAuditAttribute - Action executed by user=bhogg

And that's it. By leveraging ASP.NET Web API's improved async filter support, we have easily and non-invasively provided auditing for task reactivation. Before we conclude this section, note how processing switched from thread #81 to thread #82. This helps illustrate why we always need to ensure that the principal is associated with the HttpContext, as mentioned in the A Message Handler to Support HTTP Basic Authentication section.

# GET a Task

The last scenario we'll implement in this chapter involves retrieving data for a particular task:

Table 6-5. Get a task

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| URI | Verb | Description |
| /api/tasks/123 | GET | Gets the details for a single task |

We'll restrict the operation itself to junior workers through the use of an authorization filter, and we'll also implement a message handler to remove sensitive data from the response for users that lack a senior worker role. So much to do - let's get started!

Keeping with our bottom-up, thin-controller approach, we'll begin by adding the class that the controller delegates its work to:

ITaskByIdInquiryProcessor Interface

using WebApi2Book.Web.Api.Models;

namespace WebApi2Book.Web.Api.InquiryProcessing

{

public interface ITaskByIdInquiryProcessor

{

Task GetTask(long taskId);

}

}

TaskByIdInquiryProcessor Class

using WebApi2Book.Common.TypeMapping;

using WebApi2Book.Data.Exceptions;

using WebApi2Book.Data.SqlServer.QueryProcessors;

using WebApi2Book.Web.Api.Models;

namespace WebApi2Book.Web.Api.InquiryProcessing

{

public class TaskByIdInquiryProcessor : ITaskByIdInquiryProcessor

{

private readonly IAutoMapper \_autoMapper;

private readonly ITaskByIdQueryProcessor \_queryProcessor;

public TaskByIdInquiryProcessor(ITaskByIdQueryProcessor queryProcessor, IAutoMapper autoMapper)

{

\_queryProcessor = queryProcessor;

\_autoMapper = autoMapper;

}

public Task GetTask(long taskId)

{

var taskEntity = \_queryProcessor.GetTask(taskId);

if (taskEntity == null)

{

throw new RootObjectNotFoundException("Task not found");

}

var task = \_autoMapper.Map<Task>(taskEntity);

return task;

}

}

}

Dependency Configuration (add to bottom of NinjectConfigurator.AddBindings)

container.Bind<ITaskByIdInquiryProcessor>().To<TaskByIdInquiryProcessor>().InRequestScope();

It doesn't get much easier than that. GetTask uses the ITaskByIdQueryProcessor (which we added in the Activate a Task section, above) to fetch the entity. Then it uses the IAutoMapper to transfer the data to a service model object that can be returned in the response.

To complete the basic scenario, add the following method to the TasksController…

[Route("{id:long}", Name = "GetTaskRoute")]

public Task GetTask(long id)

{

var task = \_taskByIdInquiryProcessor.GetTask(id);

return task;

}

… and also add an authorization filter to the controller to ensure that users have a junior worker role as a minimum requirement to perform any task operation:

[ApiVersion1RoutePrefix("tasks")]

[UnitOfWorkActionFilter]

[Authorize(Roles = Constants.RoleNames.JuniorWorker)]

public class TasksController : ApiController

At this point, [Authorize(Roles = Constants.RoleNames.Manager)] is still decorating the AddTask method, because adding a task requires a manager role. This illustrates how the authorization filter with the narrower scope (the one on the method) overrides the one with the broader scope (the one on the class).

Now let's send a request to prove that this is working properly:

Get Task Request (abbreviated)

GET http://localhost:61589/api/v1/tasks/17 HTTP/1.1

Authorization: Basic YmhvZ2c6aWdub3JlZA==

Get Task Response (abbreviated)

HTTP/1.1 200 OK

Content-Type: application/json; charset=utf-8

{"TaskId":17,"Subject":"Fix something important","StartDate":"2014-05-13T00:52:34","DueDate":null,"CreatedDate":"2014-05-10T19:02:52","CompletedDate":null,"Status":{"StatusId":2,"Name":"In Progress","Ordinal":1},"Assignees":[],"Links":[]}

Yes, it looks like our Get operation is working properly, so we will move on to implementing a message handler that can conditionally remove sensitive data from the response. Before we do that, though, we need to add some members to the Task service model class for the message handler to use to remove sensitive data. Add the following members to WebApi2Book.Web.Api.Models.Task:

private bool \_shouldSerializeAssignees;

public void SetShouldSerializeAssignees(bool shouldSerialize)

{

\_shouldSerializeAssignees = shouldSerialize;

}

public bool ShouldSerializeAssignees()

{

return \_shouldSerializeAssignees;

}

By convention, the framework uses ShouldSerialize\* methods to determine if specific public properties should be serialized. We leverage this behavior by pairing ShouldSerializeAssignees with the SetShouldSerializeAssignees method to control serialization of Assignees. In doing so, we have provided a mechanism for the message handler to dynamically control whether a task's assignees should be serialized.

Now it's time to implement the message handler, so implement it as follows:

using System.Net.Http;

using System.Threading;

using System.Threading.Tasks;

using log4net;

using WebApi2Book.Common;

using WebApi2Book.Common.Logging;

using WebApi2Book.Common.Security;

using Task = WebApi2Book.Web.Api.Models.Task;

namespace WebApi2Book.Web.Api.Security

{

public class TaskDataSecurityMessageHandler : DelegatingHandler

{

private readonly ILog \_log;

private readonly IUserSession \_userSession;

public TaskDataSecurityMessageHandler(ILogManager logManager, IUserSession userSession)

{

\_userSession = userSession;

\_log = logManager.GetLog(typeof (TaskDataSecurityMessageHandler));

}

protected override async Task<HttpResponseMessage> SendAsync(

HttpRequestMessage request,

CancellationToken cancellationToken)

{

var response = await base.SendAsync(request, cancellationToken);

if (CanHandleResponse(response))

{

ApplySecurityToResponseData((ObjectContent) response.Content);

}

return response;

}

public bool CanHandleResponse(HttpResponseMessage response)

{

var objectContent = response.Content as ObjectContent;

var canHandleResponse = objectContent != null && objectContent.ObjectType == typeof (Task);

return canHandleResponse;

}

public void ApplySecurityToResponseData(ObjectContent responseObjectContent)

{

var removeSensitiveData = !\_userSession.IsInRole(Constants.RoleNames.SeniorWorker);

if (removeSensitiveData)

{

\_log.DebugFormat("Applying security data masking for user {0}", \_userSession.Username);

}

((Task) responseObjectContent.Value).SetShouldSerializeAssignees(!removeSensitiveData); }

}

}

We'll review the handler code shortly, but first we need to write the code to configure it at run time. The handler is configured during application startup, so let's return to the WebApiApplication class and modify the RegisterHandlers method so that it appears as follows:

private void RegisterHandlers()

{

var logManager = WebContainerManager.Get<ILogManager>();

var userSession = WebContainerManager.Get<IUserSession>();

GlobalConfiguration.Configuration.MessageHandlers.Add(

new BasicAuthenticationMessageHandler(logManager,

WebContainerManager.Get<IBasicSecurityService>()));

GlobalConfiguration.Configuration.MessageHandlers.Add(

new TaskDataSecurityMessageHandler(logManager, userSession));

}

Looking back at the TaskDataSecurityMessageHandler implementation, we see that it, like BasicAuthenticationMessageHandler, derives from the ASP.NET Web API's DelegatingHandler base class. As with BasicAuthenticationMessageHandler, it overrides SendAsync. However, this time the implementation passes the request on down the chain with a call to base.SendAsync without inspecting it first. That's because this handler is only interested in the response, and it's only going to act upon the response if CanHandleResponse returns true, indicating that the response contains a Task service model object.

If CanHandleResponse indicates that the response contains task data, then SendAsync invokes ApplySecurityToResponseData. It is here that the assignees are removed from the response if the user does not have a senior worker role. ApplySecurityToResponseData also logs the removal, for debugging purposes.

With this is in place, let's do a demo to make sure this sensitive data removal functionality is working. The demo won't be terribly dramatic, because at this point we haven't associated any users (or "assignees") with any tasks. However, we can at least verify that the Assignees property is being removed from the response for users that lack a senior worker role.

First, we'll test the functionality with bhogg's credentials. We can do this by repeating the request we sent at the beginning of this section. You should see something similar to the following:

Get Task Request (abbreviated)

GET http://localhost:61589/api/v1/tasks/17 HTTP/1.1

Authorization: Basic YmhvZ2c6aWdub3JlZA==

Get Task Response (abbreviated)

HTTP/1.1 200 OK

Content-Type: application/json; charset=utf-8

{"TaskId":17,"Subject":"Fix something important","StartDate":"2014-05-13T00:52:34","DueDate":null,"CreatedDate":"2014-05-10T19:02:52","CompletedDate":null,"Status":{"StatusId":2,"Name":"In Progress","Ordinal":1},"Assignees":[],"Links":[]}

Note that the Assignees property appears in the response, as expected. Now repeat the test, this time with jdoe's credentials:

Get Task Request (abbreviated)

GET http://localhost:61589/api/v1/tasks/17 HTTP/1.1

Authorization: Basic amRvZTppZ25vcmVk

Get Task Response (abbreviated)

HTTP/1.1 200 OK

Content-Type: application/json; charset=utf-8

{"TaskId":17,"Subject":"Fix something important","StartDate":"2014-05-13T00:52:34","DueDate":null,"CreatedDate":"2014-05-10T19:02:52","CompletedDate":null,"Status":{"StatusId":2,"Name":"In Progress","Ordinal":1},"Links":[]}

Correct! User jdoe is only a junior worker, so the handler stripped the Assignees property from the response. Our security is working perfectly!

In the next section, we will bring token-based security into the picture and demonstrate how non-invasive the process of adding new authentication schemes can be with ASP.NET Web API.

# And Now With Token-Based Security…

Hook in Jamie's NuGet handler. Configure it to run . Run a few of the demos, this time with Bearer requests. Show that they work w/o any modification to our existing code. Great way to showcase the framework's architecture to handle the "cross-cutting concern" of security.

\*CORS (I recommend we wait until Ch9 for this, when we hook into the UI)

\*Certificates, which are required for SSL (optional - do we even want to bother with this?)

\*Require SSL attribute (optional - maybe just mention it)

\* CSRF??? What are you planning to do about this? Is this just a sidebar somewhere

# Summary

Can use this from the ch7 intro as a starting point:

In the previous chapter, after a brief introduction to the concepts of authentication and authorization, we added security to the task-management service. We began by applying an authorization filter to secure the AddTask method, and complemented this by implementing a custom message handler supporting Basic authentication. After that, we implemented several scenarios (continuing with the theme of security) to further develop our application's functional capabilities and to demonstrate various ASP.NET Web API features (e.g., global exception handling of custom exceptions, scoping of filter attributes, serialization control, async filters). We wrapped things up by adding support for token-based security.