Digest Headers

(was: Resource Digests, was: RFC 3230)

IETF 106 Singapore

draft-ietf-httpbis-digest-headers

[see IETF105 slides] [see the specifications]

Digest HTTP Header Field summary

```
Response:
HTTP/1.1 200 Ok
Content-Type: application/json
Content-Encoding: identity
Digest: sha-256=X48E9qOokqqrvdts8nOJRJN3OWDUoyWxBf7kbu9DBPE=

{"hello": "world"}

digest-algorithm
encoded digest output
```

Who is using Digest?

- MICE content-coding (draft-thomson-http-mice)
- Signature specs: http-signatures,
 signed-exchanges
 (draft-yasskin-http-origin-signed-responses)
- Banking APIs via http-signatures

Changes in 01

Editorial sweep

- 1. Clarify state-changing methods
- 2. Reboot digest-algorithm IANA table
- 3. Relationship with Subresource Integrity (SRI)

Change 1: Clarify state-changing methods

Issue #853

POST and PATCH requests convey actions, not partial representations. Digest is then computed:

- in requests, on the representation-data of those actions.
- in responses: on the selected representation of the referenced resource. This may be the enclosed <u>OR</u> the selected representation (eg. in case of 204 No Content).

Change 1: POST example

Request:

```
POST /books/123 HTTP/1.1
                                             Request digest applies to enclosed
Content-Type: application/json
Accept: application/json
                                                                   representation
Accept-Encoding: identity
Digest: sha-256=bWopGGNiZtbVgHsG+I4knzfEJpmmmQHf7RHDXA3o1hQ=
{"title": "New Title"} ←
Response:
                                            Response digest applies to enclosed
HTTP/1.1 201 Created
                                                                   representation
Content-Type: application/json
Digest: id-sha-256=00/WKwSfnmIoSlop2LV/ISaBDth05IeW27zzNMUh518=
Location: /books/123
{"status": "created", "id": "123", "ts": 1569327729, "instance": "/books/123"}
```

Change 1: PATCH example

```
Request:
                                            JSON patch (RFC 7396)
  PATCH /books/123 HTTP/1.1
                                                 Request digest applies to
  Content-Type: application/merge-patch+json
  Accept: application/json
                                                          patch document
  Accept-Encoding: identity
  Digest: sha-256=bWopGGNiZtbVgHsG+I4knzfEJpmmmQHf7RHDXA3o1hQ=
  {"title": "New Title"} ←
  Response:
                                              Response digest applies to complete
  HTTP/1.1 200 OK
                                              representation of patched document
  Content-Type: application/json
  Digest: id-sha-256=BZ1F2v0IzjuxN01RQ97EUXriaNNLhtI8Chx8Eq+XYSc=
  {"id": "123", "title": "New Title"} ←
```

Change 1: PATCH example with 204

```
Request:
                                            JSON patch (RFC 7396)
  PATCH /books/123 HTTP/1.1
                                                 Request digest applies to
  Content-Type: application/merge-patch+json
  Accept: application/json
                                                          patch document
  Accept-Encoding: identity
  Digest: sha-256=bWopGGNiZtbVgHsG+I4knzfEJpmmmQHf7RHDXA3o1hQ=
  {"title": "New Title"} 	
                                              Response digest applies to complete
  Response:
                                        representation of patched document but no
  HTTP/1.1 204 No Content
                                                                  payload provided
  Content-Type: application/json
  Digest: id-sha-256=BZ1F2v0IzjuxN01RQ97EUXriaNNLhtI8Chx8Eq+XYSc=
```

Change 1: Open Issue #970 - Is POST behavior extensible to all payload bodies?

Julian - "I just don't think that it would be a good idea to vary the semantics based on the request method."

We can address this with some rewording but should we? E.g.

Does a present or future method convey a partial representation, and if so the digest should always be computed on the complete representation.

Thanks!

Roberto Polli - robipolli@gmail.com

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







Change 2: Reboot digest-algorithm IANA table

- New "status" field to mark deprecated/obsoleted algorithms
- Deprecate MD5 as a weak crypto algorithm (issue #867)
- Obsolete SHA and ADLER32 as there are better replacements (issue #828)
- Simplified citation of SHA (issue #832)

Open Issues Needing Input

- #936/#937 Cache and Digest
- #851 detail more the use with HTTP signatures
- #852 add a threat model?
- #849 digest of an empty representation
- #850 digest-algorithm "parameter" spec gap
- #970 Is POST behavior extensible to all payload bodies?
 (already mentioned)

#936/#937 - Cache, Digest and cache-validators

RFC 3230 states the following:

The instance is specified by the Request-URI and **any cache-validator** contained in the message.

we translated it in to RFC 723x terms:

The resource is specified by the effective request URI and **any `validator**` contained in the message.

But how **do** validators specify a resource? Is "specify" the correct term?

#851 - using Digest in signatures

- Digest main use case is with HTTP signatures
- 01 provides minimal guidance:
 - use transport integrity, sign data and metadata, avoid broken algorithms.
- Are there compelling reasons to expand on this?
 - Especially guidance related to representation-metadata e.g. Content-Length

#852 - add a threat model?

- Is a threat model useful?
- Should we document it in this I-D?
- We have some candidate text already on the issue so next steps might be:
 - a. Close, not needed
 - b. Move to a PR
 - c. Consider a broader threat modelling (see relationship to HTTP signatures issues)

#849 - digest of an empty representation

More confusing than it sounds, would examples help?

One case: an empty representation may have a non-empty body due to content-encoding, affecting Digest value.

```
>>> sha256(compress(b'')).hexdigest()
'7a53d5f4237c606ddaba52a2d4a3e40200eea48f5992172c6751209decae8d5a'
>>> sha256(b'').hexdigest()
'e3b0c44298fc1c149afbf4c8996fb92427ae41e4649b934ca495991b7852b855'
```

#850 - digest-algorithm "parameter" spec gap

RFC3230 states the following and we import it verbatim:

For some algorithms, one or more parameters may be supplied.

digest-algorithm = token

The BNF for "parameter" is as is used in RFC 2616 [4]. All digest-algorithm values are case-insensitive.

Problems:

No example of parameter, anywhere.

Reference to BNF needs updating