HTTPBIS WG Virtual Interim February 3, 2022



## **Client-Cert HTTP Header Field**

draft-ietf-httpbis-client-cert-field

Brian Campbell Mike Bishop

### **Context and Motivation**



- HTTPS application deployments often have TLS 'terminated' by a reverse proxy somewhere in front of the actual HTTP(S) application
  - 'Old fashioned' n-tier reverse proxy and origin server
  - CDN-as-a-service type offerings or application load balancing services
  - Ingress controllers
- TLS client certificate authentication is *sometimes* used
  - In which case the actual application often needs to know something about the client certificate
  - But the original TLS connection terminated upstream so that info isn't available
- In the absence of a standardized method of conveying the client certificate information, different implementations have done it differently (or not at all)

# Goal



 Informational RFC that documents existing practice while codifying specific details sufficient to facilitate improved and lower-touch interoperability going forward

• Participate...



News & blog Support us Get started Contact Links - Q Search

ABOUT \* TOPICS OF INTEREST \* PARTICIPATE \* INTERNET STANDARDS \*

★ > Participate > Meetings and events IETF 106 Singapore

16 Nov 2019 - 22 Nov 2019

IETF 106 started Saturday 16 November and ran through Friday afternoon, 22 November 2019 in Singapore.

#### The `Client-Cert` header field solution offered by the draft





# **Recent Updates**

draft-ietf-httpbis-client-cert-field-01

- Now uses Structured Fields aka RFC 8941
- Introduced a separate client\_cert\_chain header that can convey the certificate chain
  - Two fields is a bit awkward...
- Considerations added about header compression and size
- Described potential interaction with caching
- Discussed renegotiation / post-handshake auth
- Filled out IANA Considerations with HTTP field name registrations

