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Digest HTTP Header Field summary

Request:
    GET /items/123

Response:
    HTTP/1.1 200 Ok
    Content-Type: application/json
    Content-Encoding: identity
    Digest: sha-256=X48E9q0okqqrvt8snnOJRJN3OwDUoyWxBf7kbu9DBPE=

{"hello": "world"}
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 OR the selected representation (eg. in case of 204 No Content).
Change 1: POST example

Request:

POST /books/123 HTTP/1.1
Content-Type: application/json
Accept: application/json
Accept-Encoding: identity
Digest: sha-256=bWopGGNiZtbVgHsG+I4knzfEJpmmmQHf7RHDXA3o1hQ=

{"title": "New Title"}

Response:

HTTP/1.1 201 Created
Content-Type: application/json
Digest: id-sha-256=0o/WKwSfnmIoSlop2LV/ISaBDth05IeW27zzNMUh5l8=
Location: /books/123

{"status": "created", "id": "123", "ts": 1569327729, "instance": "/books/123"}
Change 1: PATCH example

Request:

PATCH /books/123 HTTP/1.1
Content-Type: application/merge-patch+json
Accept: application/json
Accept-Encoding: identity
Digest: sha-256=bWopGGNiztbVgHsG+I4knzfEJpmmmQHf7RHDxA3o1hQ=

{"title": "New Title"}

Response:

HTTP/1.1 200 OK
Content-Type: application/json
Digest: id-sha-256=BZlF2v0IzjuxN01RQ97EUxriaNNLhtI8Chx8Eq+XYSc=

{"id": "123", "title": "New Title"}
Change 1: PATCH example with 204

Request:

PATCH /books/123 HTTP/1.1
Content-Type: application/merge-patch+json
Accept: application/json
Accept-Encoding: identity
Digest: sha-256=bWopGGNiZtbVgHsG+I4knzfEJpmmmQHf7RHDXA3o1hQ=

{"title": "New Title"}

Response:

HTTP/1.1 204 No Content
Content-Type: application/json
Digest: id-sha-256=BZlF2v0IzjuxN01RQ97EUXriaNNLhtI8Chx8Eq+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 - lucaspardue.24.7@gmail.com
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)

https://github.com/httpwg/http-extensions/issues?q=is%3Aissue+is%3Aopen+label%3Adigest-headers
#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?
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.

```python
>>> sha256(compress(b'')) .hexdigest()
'7a53d5f4237c606ddaba52a2d4a3e40200eea48f5992172c6751209decaae8d5a'

>>> sha256(b'') .hexdigest()
'e3b0c44298fc1c149afbf4c8996fb92427ae41e4649b934ca495991b7852b855'
```
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