

Digest **Fields** ~~Headers~~

(was: Resource Digests, was: RFC 3230)

HTTPWG Interim 2021-09

draft-ietf-httpbis-digest-headers

[\[last interim slides\]](#) [\[latest editor copy\]](#)

Since June 2021 Interim

Almost ready for Working Group Last Call.

Thanks for the reviews and feedback.

See

<https://tools.ietf.org/rfcdiff?url1=https://tools.ietf.org/id/draft-ietf-httpbis-digest-headers-05.txt&url2=https://httpwg.org/http-extensions/draft-ietf-httpbis-digest-headers.txt>

Two different fields

`Content-Digest`: always computed on the message content in both requests and responses, like `Content-MD5` see [#1543](#)

`Digest`: computed on the complete representation data retaining consistency with RFC3230; can support future methods standardizing partial representations in requests; it is useful.

Both fields have a `Want-*` twin.

Old algorithms (again) [#1671](#)

Current

Algorithm	Status
sha-256	standard
sha-512	standard
md5	deprecated ☹
sha	deprecated ☹
unixsum	deprecated ☹
unixcksum	deprecated ☹
crc32c	deprecated ☹
adler32	deprecated ☹

Q: don't forbid old algorithms to support weak consistency cases (eg. checksum-only, insecure, ...)

Waiting for Mark's proposal

id- algorithms: retain or strip?

Do we want to retain id-sha-* algorithms?

Do we want to strip them to another I-D [#885](#)
reserving the `id-` prefix?

Towards WGLC

The editors wish to WGLC soon after this interim meeting

Any choice on those open issues should not block the last call

Thanks!

Roberto Polli - robipolli@gmail.com

Lucas Pardue - lucaspardue.24.7@gmail.com

