

(was: Resource Digests, was: RFC 3230)

HTTPWG Interim 2022-02

draft-ietf-httpbis-digest-headers

[last interim slides] [latest editor copy]

# Since September 2021 Interim

#### **WGLC**

Deep feedback from a few people, thank you

Addressed most of this, some editorial change are still to do

The question of Structured Fields (SF) came up again

One way or the other, let's agree an answer and not revisit the question

# Digest fields in editors copy

Digest = 1#representation-data-digest

-07 plus WGLC edits

digest-algorithm = token

These headers use the #rule for a list syntax.
Compatible with RFC 3230.

These lists contain token.

Encoded checksum output format varies. Not all base64. Some allow different character sets.

Summary: Incompatible with Structured Fields

#### So what about Structured Fields?

#### Option 1: Status Quo.

Achieves goal of updating Digest and Want-Digest. Adds Content-Digest and Want-Content-Digest by popular demand. Keep legacy list format for all.

#### **Option 2**: "Three headers"

Achieves goal of updating Digest and Want-Digest. Both remain as legacy list.

New: Representation-Digest and Content-Digest are SF.

New: Want-Representation-Digest and Want-Content-Digest are SF.

#### **Option 3**: "Two headers"

Digest and Want-Digest **do not** get updated. RFC 3230 stays alive but inconsistent if people want it.

New: Representation-Digest and Content-Digest are SF.

New: Want-Representation-Digest and Want-Content-Digest are SF.

### **Option 2: Three headers**

PR #1393. Text diff

Clear definition of "Representation Digest" concept that is used in Digest and Representation-Digest. Updates to digest algorithms to support 3 headers.

sf-dictionary - Keys are digest algorithms, values are sf-binary. Dupe keys handled.

```
Representation-Digest = sf-dictionary
Content-Digest = sf-dictionary
```

sf-list - items are digest algorithms. 'q' parameter is defined.

```
Want-Representation-Digest = sf-list
Want-Content-Digest = sf-list
```

### **Option 3: Two headers**

PR <u>#1394</u>. Text <u>diff</u>

Basically like Option 2 except less consideration for Digest

sf-dictionary - Keys are digest algorithms, values are sf-binary.

```
Representation-Digest = sf-dictionary
Content-Digest = sf-dictionary
```

sf-list - items are digest algorithms. 'q' parameter is defined.

```
Want-Representation-Digest = sf-list
Want-Content-Digest = sf-list
```

### **Comparison of formats**

#### Current:

Digest: sha-512=WZDPaVn/7XgHaAy8pmojAkGWoRx2UFChF41A2svX+TaPm

AbwAgBWnrIiYllu7BNNyealdVLvRwE\nmTHWXvJwew==

Content-Digest: sha-512=WZDPaVn/7XgHaAy8pmojAkGWoRx2UFChF41A2svX+TaPm

AbwAgBWnrIiYllu7BNNyealdVLvRwE\nmTHWXvJwew==

Want-Digest: sha-512;q=1, sha-256;q=0.2 Want-Content-Digest: sha-512;q=1, sha-256;q=0.2

New:

**Digest:** sha-512=WZDPaVn/7XgHaAy8pmojAkGWoRx2UFChF41A2svX+TaPm

AbwAgBWnrIiYllu7BNNyealdVLvRwE\nmTHWXvJwew==

**Representation-Digest**: sha-512=:WZDPaVn/7XgHaAy8pmojAkGWoRx2UFChF41A2svX+TaPm

AbwAgBWnrIiYllu7BNNyealdVLvRwE\nmTHWXvJwew==:

Content-Digest: sha-512=:WZDPaVn/7XgHaAy8pmojAkGWoRx2UFChF41A2svX+TaPm

AbwAgBWnrIiYllu7BNNyealdVLvRwE\nmTHWXvJwew==:

Want-Digest: sha-512;q=1, sha-256;q=0.2 Want-Representation-Digest: sha-512;q=1, sha-256;q=0.2 Want-Content-Digest: sha-512;q=1, sha-256;q=0.2

# Comparison of formats (easy diff)

Current:

Digest: sha-512=WZDPaVn/7XgHaAy8pmojAkGWoRx2UFChF41A2svX+TaPm

AbwAgBWnrIiYllu7BNNyealdVLvRwE\nmTHWXvJwew==

Content-Digest: sha-512=WZDPaVn/7XgHaAy8pmojAkGWoRx2UFChF41A2svX+TaPm

AbwAgBWnrIiYllu7BNNyealdVLvRwE\nmTHWXvJwew==

Want-Digest: sha-512;q=1, sha-256;q=0.2 Want-Content-Digest: sha-512;q=1, sha-256;q=0.2

New:

Digest: sha-512=WZDPaVn/7XgHaAy8pmojAkGWoRx2UFChF41A2svX+TaPm

AbwAgBWnrIiYllu7BNNyealdVLvRwE\nmTHWXvJwew==

Representation-Digest: sha-512=:WZDPaVn/7XgHaAy8pmojAkGWoRx2UFChF41A2svX+TaPm

AbwAgBWnrIiYllu7BNNyealdVLvRwE\nmTHWXvJwew==:

Content-Digest: sha-512=:WZDPaVn/7XgHaAy8pmojAkGWoRx2UFChF41A2svX+TaPm

AbwAgBWnrIiYllu7BNNyealdVLvRwE\nmTHWXvJwew==:

Want-Digest: sha-512;q=1, sha-256;q=0.2

Want-Representation-Digest: sha-512;q=1, sha-256;q=0.2 Want-Content-Digest: sha-512;q=1, sha-256;q=0.2

#### Pick one and move on

	Option 1: Update 3230, add Content-Digest	<b>Option 2:</b> Update 3230, introduce new Digest SF	<b>Option 3:</b> leave RFC3230 behind, introduce new Digest SF
Digest	Becomes consistent with HTTP  Syntax backward compatible with RFC3230 to support current implementers (OpenBankingEurope, EU cross-border transactions)	Becomes consistent with HTTP  Syntax backward compatible with RFC3230 to support current implementers  Current implementers can plan a transition to representation-digest	Remains Inconsistent with HTTP  Current implementers will remain inconsistent with HTTP  No signature guidance
Want-Digest	   Signature guidance		
Content-Digest	Signature guidance		H CE /I :-t D:-t:
Want-Content-Digest	No SF	Use SF (List or Dictionary)	Use SF (List or Dictionary)  New implementers will
Representation-Digest	X	New implementers will adopt Representation-Digest	adopt
Want-Representation-Digest	X		Representation-Digest

# If we pick any SF option, there's more work

Need to choose the syntax of SF. Suggestions below

Representation-Digest, Content-Digest: sf-dictionary

Keys are algorithms. Digest's digest-algorithm is token. Incompatible, need IANA massaging.

Want-Representation-Digest, Want-Content-Digest: sf-list

List items are sf-token, a little different to key. Needs IANA messaging.

'q' parameter is reinvention of HTTP qvalue. Should we standardize a common SF qvalue rather than reinvent it everywhere?

#### Thanks!

Roberto Polli - robipolli@gmail.com

Lucas Pardue - <u>lucaspardue.24.7@gmail.com</u>





