

HTTPbis Working Group  
Internet-Draft  
Obsoletes: [2145](#),2616 (if approved)  
Updates: [2817](#),2818 (if approved)  
Intended status: Standards Track  
Expires: January 16, 2014

R. Fielding, Ed.  
Adobe  
J. Reschke, Ed.  
greenbytes  
July 15, 2013

## **Hypertext Transfer Protocol (HTTP/1.1): Message Syntax and Routing draft-ietf-httpbis-p1-messaging-23**

### Abstract

The Hypertext Transfer Protocol (HTTP) is an application-level protocol for distributed, collaborative, hypertext information systems. HTTP has been in use by the World Wide Web global information initiative since 1990. This document provides an overview of HTTP architecture and its associated terminology, defines the "http" and "https" Uniform Resource Identifier (URI) schemes, defines the HTTP/1.1 message syntax and parsing requirements, and describes general security concerns for implementations.

### Editorial Note (To be removed by RFC Editor)

Discussion of this draft takes place on the HTTPBIS working group mailing list ([ietf-http-wg@w3.org](mailto:ietf-http-wg@w3.org)), which is archived at <http://lists.w3.org/Archives/Public/ietf-http-wg/>.

The current issues list is at <http://tools.ietf.org/wg/httpbis/trac/report/3> and related documents (including fancy diffs) can be found at <http://tools.ietf.org/wg/httpbis/>.

The changes in this draft are summarized in [Appendix D.3](#).

### Status of This Memo

This Internet-Draft is submitted in full conformance with the provisions of [BCP 78](#) and [BCP 79](#).

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts. The list of current Internet-Drafts is at <http://datatracker.ietf.org/drafts/current/>.

Internet-Drafts are draft documents valid for a maximum of six months and may be updated, replaced, or obsoleted by other documents at any time. It is inappropriate to use Internet-Drafts as reference

material or to cite them other than as "work in progress."

This Internet-Draft will expire on January 16, 2014.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2013 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

This document is subject to [BCP 78](#) and the IETF Trust's Legal Provisions Relating to IETF Documents (<http://trustee.ietf.org/license-info>) in effect on the date of publication of this document. Please review these documents carefully, as they describe your rights and restrictions with respect to this document. Code Components extracted from this document must include Simplified BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the Trust Legal Provisions and are provided without warranty as described in the Simplified BSD License.

This document may contain material from IETF Documents or IETF Contributions published or made publicly available before November 10, 2008. The person(s) controlling the copyright in some of this material may not have granted the IETF Trust the right to allow modifications of such material outside the IETF Standards Process. Without obtaining an adequate license from the person(s) controlling the copyright in such materials, this document may not be modified outside the IETF Standards Process, and derivative works of it may not be created outside the IETF Standards Process, except to format it for publication as an RFC or to translate it into languages other than English.

Table of Contents

- [1.](#) Introduction . . . . . [5](#)
- [1.1.](#) Requirement Notation . . . . . [6](#)
- [1.2.](#) Syntax Notation . . . . . [6](#)
- [2.](#) Architecture . . . . . [6](#)
- [2.1.](#) Client/Server Messaging . . . . . [7](#)
- [2.2.](#) Implementation Diversity . . . . . [8](#)
- [2.3.](#) Intermediaries . . . . . [9](#)
- [2.4.](#) Caches . . . . . [11](#)
- [2.5.](#) Conformance and Error Handling . . . . . [12](#)
- [2.6.](#) Protocol Versioning . . . . . [13](#)
- [2.7.](#) Uniform Resource Identifiers . . . . . [15](#)
- [2.7.1.](#) http URI scheme . . . . . [16](#)
- [2.7.2.](#) https URI scheme . . . . . [17](#)
- [2.7.3.](#) http and https URI Normalization and Comparison . . . [18](#)
- [3.](#) Message Format . . . . . [19](#)



3.1.	Start Line . . . . .	20
3.1.1.	Request Line . . . . .	20
3.1.2.	Status Line . . . . .	21
3.2.	Header Fields . . . . .	22
3.2.1.	Field Extensibility . . . . .	22
3.2.2.	Field Order . . . . .	22
3.2.3.	Whitespace . . . . .	23
3.2.4.	Field Parsing . . . . .	24
3.2.5.	Field Limits . . . . .	25
3.2.6.	Field value components . . . . .	25
3.3.	Message Body . . . . .	27
3.3.1.	Transfer-Encoding . . . . .	27
3.3.2.	Content-Length . . . . .	29
3.3.3.	Message Body Length . . . . .	30
3.4.	Handling Incomplete Messages . . . . .	32
3.5.	Message Parsing Robustness . . . . .	33
4.	Transfer Codings . . . . .	34
4.1.	Chunked Transfer Coding . . . . .	34
4.1.1.	Trailer . . . . .	35
4.1.2.	Decoding chunked . . . . .	36
4.2.	Compression Codings . . . . .	37
4.2.1.	Compress Coding . . . . .	37
4.2.2.	Deflate Coding . . . . .	37
4.2.3.	Gzip Coding . . . . .	37
4.3.	TE . . . . .	37
5.	Message Routing . . . . .	38
5.1.	Identifying a Target Resource . . . . .	38
5.2.	Connecting Inbound . . . . .	39
5.3.	Request Target . . . . .	39
5.4.	Host . . . . .	41
5.5.	Effective Request URI . . . . .	43
5.6.	Associating a Response to a Request . . . . .	44
5.7.	Message Forwarding . . . . .	44
5.7.1.	Via . . . . .	45
5.7.2.	Transformations . . . . .	46
6.	Connection Management . . . . .	47
6.1.	Connection . . . . .	48
6.2.	Establishment . . . . .	49
6.3.	Persistence . . . . .	49
6.3.1.	Retrying Requests . . . . .	51
6.3.2.	Pipelining . . . . .	51
6.4.	Concurrency . . . . .	52
6.5.	Failures and Time-outs . . . . .	52
6.6.	Tear-down . . . . .	53
6.7.	Upgrade . . . . .	54
7.	IANA Considerations . . . . .	56
7.1.	Header Field Registration . . . . .	56
7.2.	URI Scheme Registration . . . . .	57



<a href="#">7.3.</a>	Internet Media Type Registration . . . . .	<a href="#">57</a>
<a href="#">7.3.1.</a>	Internet Media Type message/http . . . . .	<a href="#">57</a>
<a href="#">7.3.2.</a>	Internet Media Type application/http . . . . .	<a href="#">58</a>
<a href="#">7.4.</a>	Transfer Coding Registry . . . . .	<a href="#">60</a>
<a href="#">7.4.1.</a>	Procedure . . . . .	<a href="#">60</a>
<a href="#">7.4.2.</a>	Registration . . . . .	<a href="#">60</a>
<a href="#">7.5.</a>	Upgrade Token Registry . . . . .	<a href="#">61</a>
<a href="#">7.5.1.</a>	Procedure . . . . .	<a href="#">61</a>
<a href="#">7.5.2.</a>	Upgrade Token Registration . . . . .	<a href="#">61</a>
<a href="#">8.</a>	Security Considerations . . . . .	<a href="#">62</a>
<a href="#">8.1.</a>	DNS-related Attacks . . . . .	<a href="#">62</a>
<a href="#">8.2.</a>	Intermediaries and Caching . . . . .	<a href="#">62</a>
<a href="#">8.3.</a>	Buffer Overflows . . . . .	<a href="#">63</a>
<a href="#">8.4.</a>	Message Integrity . . . . .	<a href="#">63</a>
<a href="#">8.5.</a>	Server Log Information . . . . .	<a href="#">64</a>
<a href="#">9.</a>	Acknowledgments . . . . .	<a href="#">64</a>
<a href="#">10.</a>	References . . . . .	<a href="#">66</a>
<a href="#">10.1.</a>	Normative References . . . . .	<a href="#">66</a>
<a href="#">10.2.</a>	Informative References . . . . .	<a href="#">67</a>
<a href="#">Appendix A.</a>	HTTP Version History . . . . .	<a href="#">69</a>
<a href="#">A.1.</a>	Changes from HTTP/1.0 . . . . .	<a href="#">70</a>
<a href="#">A.1.1.</a>	Multi-homed Web Servers . . . . .	<a href="#">70</a>
<a href="#">A.1.2.</a>	Keep-Alive Connections . . . . .	<a href="#">70</a>
<a href="#">A.1.3.</a>	Introduction of Transfer-Encoding . . . . .	<a href="#">71</a>
<a href="#">A.2.</a>	Changes from <a href="#">RFC 2616</a> . . . . .	<a href="#">71</a>
<a href="#">Appendix B.</a>	ABNF list extension: #rule . . . . .	<a href="#">74</a>
<a href="#">Appendix C.</a>	Collected ABNF . . . . .	<a href="#">75</a>
<a href="#">Appendix D.</a>	Change Log (to be removed by RFC Editor before publication) . . . . .	<a href="#">77</a>
<a href="#">D.1.</a>	Since <a href="#">RFC 2616</a> . . . . .	<a href="#">77</a>
<a href="#">D.2.</a>	Since <a href="#">draft-ietf-httpbis-p1-messaging-21</a> . . . . .	<a href="#">77</a>
<a href="#">D.3.</a>	Since <a href="#">draft-ietf-httpbis-p1-messaging-22</a> . . . . .	<a href="#">79</a>
Index	. . . . .	<a href="#">80</a>



## **1. Introduction**

The Hypertext Transfer Protocol (HTTP) is an application-level request/response protocol that uses extensible semantics and self-descriptive message payloads for flexible interaction with network-based hypertext information systems. This document is the first in a series of documents that collectively form the HTTP/1.1 specification:

RFC xxx1: Message Syntax and Routing

RFC xxx2: Semantics and Content

RFC xxx3: Conditional Requests

RFC xxx4: Range Requests

RFC xxx5: Caching

RFC xxx6: Authentication

This HTTP/1.1 specification obsoletes and moves to historic status [RFC 2616](#), its predecessor [RFC 2068](#), and [RFC 2145](#) (on HTTP versioning). This specification also updates the use of CONNECT to establish a tunnel, previously defined in [RFC 2817](#), and defines the "https" URI scheme that was described informally in [RFC 2818](#).

HTTP is a generic interface protocol for information systems. It is designed to hide the details of how a service is implemented by presenting a uniform interface to clients that is independent of the types of resources provided. Likewise, servers do not need to be aware of each client's purpose: an HTTP request can be considered in isolation rather than being associated with a specific type of client or a predetermined sequence of application steps. The result is a protocol that can be used effectively in many different contexts and for which implementations can evolve independently over time.

HTTP is also designed for use as an intermediation protocol for translating communication to and from non-HTTP information systems. HTTP proxies and gateways can provide access to alternative information services by translating their diverse protocols into a hypertext format that can be viewed and manipulated by clients in the same way as HTTP services.

One consequence of this flexibility is that the protocol cannot be defined in terms of what occurs behind the interface. Instead, we are limited to defining the syntax of communication, the intent of received communication, and the expected behavior of recipients. If





the communication is considered in isolation, then successful actions ought to be reflected in corresponding changes to the observable interface provided by servers. However, since multiple clients might act in parallel and perhaps at cross-purposes, we cannot require that such changes be observable beyond the scope of a single response.

This document describes the architectural elements that are used or referred to in HTTP, defines the "http" and "https" URI schemes, describes overall network operation and connection management, and defines HTTP message framing and forwarding requirements. Our goal is to define all of the mechanisms necessary for HTTP message handling that are independent of message semantics, thereby defining the complete set of requirements for message parsers and message-forwarding intermediaries.

### **1.1. Requirement Notation**

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in [[RFC2119](#)].

Conformance criteria and considerations regarding error handling are defined in [Section 2.5](#).

### **1.2. Syntax Notation**

This specification uses the Augmented Backus-Naur Form (ABNF) notation of [[RFC5234](#)] with the list rule extension defined in [Appendix B](#). [Appendix C](#) shows the collected ABNF with the list rule expanded.

The following core rules are included by reference, as defined in [[RFC5234](#), [Appendix B.1](#)]: ALPHA (letters), CR (carriage return), CRLF (CR LF), CTL (controls), DIGIT (decimal 0-9), DQUOTE (double quote), HEXDIG (hexadecimal 0-9/A-F/a-f), HTAB (horizontal tab), LF (line feed), OCTET (any 8-bit sequence of data), SP (space), and VCHAR (any visible [[USASCII](#)] character).

As a convention, ABNF rule names prefixed with "obs-" denote "obsolete" grammar rules that appear for historical reasons.

## **2. Architecture**

HTTP was created for the World Wide Web architecture and has evolved over time to support the scalability needs of a worldwide hypertext system. Much of that architecture is reflected in the terminology and syntax productions used to define HTTP.



## 2.1. Client/Server Messaging

HTTP is a stateless request/response protocol that operates by exchanging messages ([Section 3](#)) across a reliable transport or session-layer "connection" ([Section 6](#)). An HTTP "client" is a program that establishes a connection to a server for the purpose of sending one or more HTTP requests. An HTTP "server" is a program that accepts connections in order to service HTTP requests by sending HTTP responses.

The terms client and server refer only to the roles that these programs perform for a particular connection. The same program might act as a client on some connections and a server on others. We use the term "user agent" to refer to any of the various client programs that initiate a request, including (but not limited to) browsers, spiders (web-based robots), command-line tools, native applications, and mobile apps. The term "origin server" is used to refer to the program that can originate authoritative responses to a request. For general requirements, we use the terms "sender" and "recipient" to refer to any component that sends or receives, respectively, a given message.

HTTP relies upon the Uniform Resource Identifier (URI) standard [[RFC3986](#)] to indicate the target resource ([Section 5.1](#)) and relationships between resources. Messages are passed in a format similar to that used by Internet mail [[RFC5322](#)] and the Multipurpose Internet Mail Extensions (MIME) [[RFC2045](#)] (see [Appendix A](#) of [[Part2](#)] for the differences between HTTP and MIME messages).

Most HTTP communication consists of a retrieval request (GET) for a representation of some resource identified by a URI. In the simplest case, this might be accomplished via a single bidirectional connection (==) between the user agent (UA) and the origin server (O).

```

      request  >
UA ===== 0
              <  response

```

A client sends an HTTP request to a server in the form of a request message, beginning with a request-line that includes a method, URI, and protocol version ([Section 3.1.1](#)), followed by header fields containing request modifiers, client information, and representation metadata ([Section 3.2](#)), an empty line to indicate the end of the header section, and finally a message body containing the payload body (if any, [Section 3.3](#)).

A server responds to a client's request by sending one or more HTTP



response messages, each beginning with a status line that includes the protocol version, a success or error code, and textual reason phrase ([Section 3.1.2](#)), possibly followed by header fields containing server information, resource metadata, and representation metadata ([Section 3.2](#)), an empty line to indicate the end of the header section, and finally a message body containing the payload body (if any, [Section 3.3](#)).

A connection might be used for multiple request/response exchanges, as defined in [Section 6.3](#).

The following example illustrates a typical message exchange for a GET request on the URI "http://www.example.com/hello.txt":

client request:

```
GET /hello.txt HTTP/1.1
User-Agent: curl/7.16.3 libcurl/7.16.3 OpenSSL/0.9.7l zlib/1.2.3
Host: www.example.com
Accept-Language: en, mi
```

server response:

```
HTTP/1.1 200 OK
Date: Mon, 27 Jul 2009 12:28:53 GMT
Server: Apache
Last-Modified: Wed, 22 Jul 2009 19:15:56 GMT
ETag: "34aa387-d-1568eb00"
Accept-Ranges: bytes
Content-Length: 51
Vary: Accept-Encoding
Content-Type: text/plain
```

Hello World! My payload includes a trailing CRLF.

## [2.2. Implementation Diversity](#)

When considering the design of HTTP, it is easy to fall into a trap of thinking that all user agents are general-purpose browsers and all origin servers are large public websites. That is not the case in practice. Common HTTP user agents include household appliances, stereos, scales, firmware update scripts, command-line programs, mobile apps, and communication devices in a multitude of shapes and sizes. Likewise, common HTTP origin servers include home automation units, configurable networking components, office machines, autonomous robots, news feeds, traffic cameras, ad selectors, and video delivery platforms.




The term "user agent" does not imply that there is a human user directly interacting with the software agent at the time of a request. In many cases, a user agent is installed or configured to run in the background and save its results for later inspection (or save only a subset of those results that might be interesting or erroneous). Spiders, for example, are typically given a start URI and configured to follow certain behavior while crawling the Web as a hypertext graph.

The implementation diversity of HTTP means that we cannot assume the user agent can make interactive suggestions to a user or provide adequate warning for security or privacy options. In the few cases where this specification requires reporting of errors to the user, it is acceptable for such reporting to only be observable in an error console or log file. Likewise, requirements that an automated action be confirmed by the user before proceeding might be met via advance configuration choices, run-time options, or simple avoidance of the unsafe action; confirmation does not imply any specific user interface or interruption of normal processing if the user has already made that choice.

**2.3. Intermediaries**

HTTP enables the use of intermediaries to satisfy requests through a chain of connections. There are three common forms of HTTP intermediary: proxy, gateway, and tunnel. In some cases, a single intermediary might act as an origin server, proxy, gateway, or tunnel, switching behavior based on the nature of each request.



The figure above shows three intermediaries (A, B, and C) between the user agent and origin server. A request or response message that travels the whole chain will pass through four separate connections. Some HTTP communication options might apply only to the connection with the nearest, non-tunnel neighbor, only to the end-points of the chain, or to all connections along the chain. Although the diagram is linear, each participant might be engaged in multiple, simultaneous communications. For example, B might be receiving requests from many clients other than A, and/or forwarding requests to servers other than C, at the same time that it is handling A's request. Likewise, later requests might be sent through a different path of connections, often based on dynamic configuration for load balancing.

We use the terms "upstream" and "downstream" to describe various





requirements in relation to the directional flow of a message: all messages flow from upstream to downstream. Likewise, we use the terms inbound and outbound to refer to directions in relation to the request path: "inbound" means toward the origin server and "outbound" means toward the user agent.

A "proxy" is a message forwarding agent that is selected by the client, usually via local configuration rules, to receive requests for some type(s) of absolute URI and attempt to satisfy those requests via translation through the HTTP interface. Some translations are minimal, such as for proxy requests for "http" URIs, whereas other requests might require translation to and from entirely different application-level protocols. Proxies are often used to group an organization's HTTP requests through a common intermediary for the sake of security, annotation services, or shared caching.

An HTTP-to-HTTP proxy is called a "transforming proxy" if it is designed or configured to modify request or response messages in a semantically meaningful way (i.e., modifications, beyond those required by normal HTTP processing, that change the message in a way that would be significant to the original sender or potentially significant to downstream recipients). For example, a transforming proxy might be acting as a shared annotation server (modifying responses to include references to a local annotation database), a malware filter, a format transcoder, or an intranet-to-Internet privacy filter. Such transformations are presumed to be desired by the client (or client organization) that selected the proxy and are beyond the scope of this specification. However, when a proxy is not intended to transform a given message, we use the term "non-transforming proxy" to target requirements that preserve HTTP message semantics. See Section 6.3.4 of [\[Part2\]](#) and [Section 7.5](#) of [\[Part6\]](#) for status and warning codes related to transformations.

A "gateway" (a.k.a., "reverse proxy") is an intermediary that acts as an origin server for the outbound connection, but translates received requests and forwards them inbound to another server or servers. Gateways are often used to encapsulate legacy or untrusted information services, to improve server performance through "accelerator" caching, and to enable partitioning or load balancing of HTTP services across multiple machines.

All HTTP requirements applicable to an origin server also apply to the outbound communication of a gateway. A gateway communicates with inbound servers using any protocol that it desires, including private extensions to HTTP that are outside the scope of this specification. However, an HTTP-to-HTTP gateway that wishes to interoperate with third-party HTTP servers ought to conform to user agent requirements on the gateway's inbound connection.



A "tunnel" acts as a blind relay between two connections without changing the messages. Once active, a tunnel is not considered a party to the HTTP communication, though the tunnel might have been initiated by an HTTP request. A tunnel ceases to exist when both ends of the relayed connection are closed. Tunnels are used to extend a virtual connection through an intermediary, such as when Transport Layer Security (TLS, [\[RFC5246\]](#)) is used to establish confidential communication through a shared firewall proxy.

The above categories for intermediary only consider those acting as participants in the HTTP communication. There are also intermediaries that can act on lower layers of the network protocol stack, filtering or redirecting HTTP traffic without the knowledge or permission of message senders. Network intermediaries often introduce security flaws or interoperability problems by violating HTTP semantics. For example, an "interception proxy" [\[RFC3040\]](#) (also commonly known as a "transparent proxy" [\[RFC1919\]](#) or "captive portal") differs from an HTTP proxy because it is not selected by the client. Instead, an interception proxy filters or redirects outgoing TCP port 80 packets (and occasionally other common port traffic). Interception proxies are commonly found on public network access points, as a means of enforcing account subscription prior to allowing use of non-local Internet services, and within corporate firewalls to enforce network usage policies. They are indistinguishable from a man-in-the-middle attack.

HTTP is defined as a stateless protocol, meaning that each request message can be understood in isolation. Many implementations depend on HTTP's stateless design in order to reuse proxied connections or dynamically load-balance requests across multiple servers. Hence, servers MUST NOT assume that two requests on the same connection are from the same user agent unless the connection is secured and specific to that agent. Some non-standard HTTP extensions (e.g., [\[RFC4559\]](#)) have been known to violate this requirement, resulting in security and interoperability problems.


#### **[2.4.](#) Caches**

A "cache" is a local store of previous response messages and the subsystem that controls its message storage, retrieval, and deletion. A cache stores cacheable responses in order to reduce the response time and network bandwidth consumption on future, equivalent requests. Any client or server MAY employ a cache, though a cache cannot be used by a server while it is acting as a tunnel.

The effect of a cache is that the request/response chain is shortened if one of the participants along the chain has a cached response applicable to that request. The following illustrates the resulting



chain if B has a cached copy of an earlier response from O (via C) for a request that has not been cached by UA or A.



A response is "cacheable" if a cache is allowed to store a copy of the response message for use in answering subsequent requests. Even when a response is cacheable, there might be additional constraints placed by the client or by the origin server on when that cached response can be used for a particular request. HTTP requirements for cache behavior and cacheable responses are defined in Section 2 of [Part6].

There are a wide variety of architectures and configurations of caches deployed across the World Wide Web and inside large organizations. These include national hierarchies of proxy caches to save transoceanic bandwidth, collaborative systems that broadcast or multicast cache entries, archives of pre-fetched cache entries for use in off-line or high-latency environments, and so on.

**2.5. Conformance and Error Handling**

This specification targets conformance criteria according to the role of a participant in HTTP communication. Hence, HTTP requirements are placed on senders, recipients, clients, servers, user agents, intermediaries, origin servers, proxies, gateways, or caches, depending on what behavior is being constrained by the requirement. Additional (social) requirements are placed on implementations, resource owners, and protocol element registrations when they apply beyond the scope of a single communication.

The verb "generate" is used instead of "send" where a requirement differentiates between creating a protocol element and merely forwarding a received element downstream.

An implementation is considered conformant if it complies with all of the requirements associated with the roles it partakes in HTTP.

Conformance applies to both the syntax and semantics of HTTP protocol elements. A sender MUST NOT generate protocol elements that convey a meaning that is known by that sender to be false. A sender MUST NOT generate protocol elements that do not match the grammar defined by the ABNF rules for those protocol elements that are applicable to the sender's role. If a received protocol element is processed, the recipient MUST be able to parse any value that would match the ABNF rules for that protocol element, excluding only those rules not



applicable to the recipient's role.

Unless noted otherwise, a recipient MAY attempt to recover a usable protocol element from an invalid construct. HTTP does not define specific error handling mechanisms except when they have a direct impact on security, since different applications of the protocol require different error handling strategies. For example, a Web browser might wish to transparently recover from a response where the Location header field doesn't parse according to the ABNF, whereas a systems control client might consider any form of error recovery to be dangerous.

## 2.6. Protocol Versioning

HTTP uses a "<major>.<minor>" numbering scheme to indicate versions of the protocol. This specification defines version "1.1". The protocol version as a whole indicates the sender's conformance with the set of requirements laid out in that version's corresponding specification of HTTP.

The version of an HTTP message is indicated by an HTTP-version field in the first line of the message. HTTP-version is case-sensitive.

```
HTTP-version = HTTP-name "/" DIGIT "." DIGIT
HTTP-name    = %x48.54.54.50 ; "HTTP", case-sensitive
```

The HTTP version number consists of two decimal digits separated by a "." (period or decimal point). The first digit ("major version") indicates the HTTP messaging syntax, whereas the second digit ("minor version") indicates the highest minor version within that major version to which the sender is conformant and able to understand for future communication. The minor version advertises the sender's communication capabilities even when the sender is only using a backwards-compatible subset of the protocol, thereby letting the recipient know that more advanced features can be used in response (by servers) or in future requests (by clients).

When an HTTP/1.1 message is sent to an HTTP/1.0 recipient [[RFC1945](#)] or a recipient whose version is unknown, the HTTP/1.1 message is constructed such that it can be interpreted as a valid HTTP/1.0 message if all of the newer features are ignored. This specification places recipient-version requirements on some new features so that a conformant sender will only use compatible features until it has determined, through configuration or the receipt of a message, that the recipient supports HTTP/1.1.

The interpretation of a header field does not change between minor versions of the same major HTTP version, though the default behavior





of a recipient in the absence of such a field can change. Unless specified otherwise, header fields defined in HTTP/1.1 are defined for all versions of HTTP/1.x. In particular, the Host and Connection header fields ought to be implemented by all HTTP/1.x implementations whether or not they advertise conformance with HTTP/1.1.

New header fields can be defined such that, when they are understood by a recipient, they might override or enhance the interpretation of previously defined header fields. When an implementation receives an unrecognized header field, the recipient **MUST** ignore that header field for local processing regardless of the message's HTTP version. An unrecognized header field received by a proxy **MUST** be forwarded downstream unless the header field's field-name is listed in the message's Connection header field (see [Section 6.1](#)). These requirements allow HTTP's functionality to be enhanced without requiring prior update of deployed intermediaries.

Intermediaries that process HTTP messages (i.e., all intermediaries other than those acting as tunnels) **MUST** send their own HTTP-version in forwarded messages. In other words, they **MUST NOT** blindly forward the first line of an HTTP message without ensuring that the protocol version in that message matches a version to which that intermediary is conformant for both the receiving and sending of messages. Forwarding an HTTP message without rewriting the HTTP-version might result in communication errors when downstream recipients use the message sender's version to determine what features are safe to use for later communication with that sender.

A client **SHOULD** send a request version equal to the highest version to which the client is conformant and whose major version is no higher than the highest version supported by the server, if this is known. A client **MUST NOT** send a version to which it is not conformant.

A client **MAY** send a lower request version if it is known that the server incorrectly implements the HTTP specification, but only after the client has attempted at least one normal request and determined from the response status or header fields (e.g., Server) that the server improperly handles higher request versions.

A server **SHOULD** send a response version equal to the highest version to which the server is conformant and whose major version is less than or equal to the one received in the request. A server **MUST NOT** send a version to which it is not conformant. A server **MAY** send a 505 (HTTP Version Not Supported) response if it cannot send a response using the major version used in the client's request.

A server **MAY** send an HTTP/1.0 response to a request if it is known or



suspected that the client incorrectly implements the HTTP specification and is incapable of correctly processing later version responses, such as when a client fails to parse the version number correctly or when an intermediary is known to blindly forward the HTTP-version even when it doesn't conform to the given minor version of the protocol. Such protocol downgrades SHOULD NOT be performed unless triggered by specific client attributes, such as when one or more of the request header fields (e.g., User-Agent) uniquely match the values sent by a client known to be in error.

The intention of HTTP's versioning design is that the major number will only be incremented if an incompatible message syntax is introduced, and that the minor number will only be incremented when changes made to the protocol have the effect of adding to the message semantics or implying additional capabilities of the sender. However, the minor version was not incremented for the changes introduced between [\[RFC2068\]](#) and [\[RFC2616\]](#), and this revision has specifically avoided any such changes to the protocol.

When an HTTP message is received with a major version number that the recipient implements, but a higher minor version number than what the recipient implements, the recipient SHOULD process the message as if it were in the highest minor version within that major version to which the recipient is conformant. A recipient can assume that a message with a higher minor version, when sent to a recipient that has not yet indicated support for that higher version, is sufficiently backwards-compatible to be safely processed by any implementation of the same major version.

## **[2.7.](#) Uniform Resource Identifiers**

Uniform Resource Identifiers (URIs) [\[RFC3986\]](#) are used throughout HTTP as the means for identifying resources (Section 2 of [\[Part2\]](#)). URI references are used to target requests, indicate redirects, and define relationships.

This specification adopts the definitions of "URI-reference", "absolute-URI", "relative-part", "authority", "port", "host", "path-abempty", "segment", "query", and "fragment" from the URI generic syntax. In addition, we define an "absolute-path" rule (that differs from [RFC 3986](#)'s "path-absolute" in that it allows a leading "//") and a "partial-URI" rule for protocol elements that allow a relative URI but not a fragment.



URI-reference = <URI-reference, defined in [\[RFC3986\], Section 4.1](#)>  
absolute-URI = <absolute-URI, defined in [\[RFC3986\], Section 4.3](#)>  
relative-part = <relative-part, defined in [\[RFC3986\], Section 4.2](#)>  
authority = <authority, defined in [\[RFC3986\], Section 3.2](#)>  
uri-host = <host, defined in [\[RFC3986\], Section 3.2.2](#)>  
port = <port, defined in [\[RFC3986\], Section 3.2.3](#)>  
path-abempty = <path-abempty, defined in [\[RFC3986\], Section 3.3](#)>  
segment = <segment, defined in [\[RFC3986\], Section 3.3](#)>  
query = <query, defined in [\[RFC3986\], Section 3.4](#)>  
fragment = <fragment, defined in [\[RFC3986\], Section 3.5](#)>

absolute-path = 1\*( "/" segment )  
partial-URI = relative-part [ "?" query ]

Each protocol element in HTTP that allows a URI reference will indicate in its ABNF production whether the element allows any form of reference (URI-reference), only a URI in absolute form (absolute-URI), only the path and optional query components, or some combination of the above. Unless otherwise indicated, URI references are parsed relative to the effective request URI ([Section 5.5](#)).

### **[2.7.1. http URI scheme](#)**

The "http" URI scheme is hereby defined for the purpose of minting identifiers according to their association with the hierarchical namespace governed by a potential HTTP origin server listening for TCP ([\[RFC0793\]](#)) connections on a given port.

http-URI = "http:" "//" authority path-abempty [ "?" query ]  
[ "#" fragment ]

The HTTP origin server is identified by the generic syntax's authority component, which includes a host identifier and optional TCP port ([\[RFC3986\], Section 3.2.2](#)). The remainder of the URI, consisting of both the hierarchical path component and optional query component, serves as an identifier for a potential resource within that origin server's name space.

If the host identifier is provided as an IP address, then the origin server is any listener on the indicated TCP port at that IP address. If host is a registered name, then that name is considered an indirect identifier and the recipient might use a name resolution service, such as DNS, to find the address of a listener for that host. The host MUST NOT be empty; if an "http" URI is received with an empty host, then it MUST be rejected as invalid. If the port subcomponent is empty or not given, then TCP port 80 is assumed (the default reserved port for WWW services).



Regardless of the form of host identifier, access to that host is not implied by the mere presence of its name or address. The host might or might not exist and, even when it does exist, might or might not be running an HTTP server or listening to the indicated port. The "http" URI scheme makes use of the delegated nature of Internet names and addresses to establish a naming authority (whatever entity has the ability to place an HTTP server at that Internet name or address) and allows that authority to determine which names are valid and how they might be used.

When an "http" URI is used within a context that calls for access to the indicated resource, a client MAY attempt access by resolving the host to an IP address, establishing a TCP connection to that address on the indicated port, and sending an HTTP request message ([Section 3](#)) containing the URI's identifying data ([Section 5](#)) to the server. If the server responds to that request with a non-interim HTTP response message, as described in Section 6 of [[Part2](#)], then that response is considered an authoritative answer to the client's request.

Although HTTP is independent of the transport protocol, the "http" scheme is specific to TCP-based services because the name delegation process depends on TCP for establishing authority. An HTTP service based on some other underlying connection protocol would presumably be identified using a different URI scheme, just as the "https" scheme (below) is used for resources that require an end-to-end secured connection. Other protocols might also be used to provide access to "http" identified resources -- it is only the authoritative interface that is specific to TCP.

The URI generic syntax for authority also includes a deprecated userinfo subcomponent ([\[RFC3986\], Section 3.2.1](#)) for including user authentication information in the URI. Some implementations make use of the userinfo component for internal configuration of authentication information, such as within command invocation options, configuration files, or bookmark lists, even though such usage might expose a user identifier or password. Senders MUST exclude the userinfo subcomponent (and its "@" delimiter) when an "http" URI is transmitted within a message as a request target or header field value. Recipients of an "http" URI reference SHOULD parse for userinfo and treat its presence as an error, since it is likely being used to obscure the authority for the sake of phishing attacks.

### [2.7.2.](#) https URI scheme

The "https" URI scheme is hereby defined for the purpose of minting identifiers according to their association with the hierarchical





namespace governed by a potential HTTP origin server listening to a given TCP port for TLS-secured connections ([RFC0793], [RFC5246]).

All of the requirements listed above for the "http" scheme are also requirements for the "https" scheme, except that a default TCP port of 443 is assumed if the port subcomponent is empty or not given, and the TCP connection MUST be secured, end-to-end, through the use of strong encryption prior to sending the first HTTP request.

```
https-URI = "https:" "://" authority path-abempty [ "?" query ]  
           [ "#" fragment ]
```

Note that the "https" URI scheme depends on both TLS and TCP for establishing authority. Resources made available via the "https" scheme have no shared identity with the "http" scheme even if their resource identifiers indicate the same authority (the same host listening to the same TCP port). They are distinct name spaces and are considered to be distinct origin servers. However, an extension to HTTP that is defined to apply to entire host domains, such as the Cookie protocol [RFC6265], can allow information set by one service to impact communication with other services within a matching group of host domains.

The process for authoritative access to an "https" identified resource is defined in [RFC2818].

### **2.7.3. http and https URI Normalization and Comparison**

Since the "http" and "https" schemes conform to the URI generic syntax, such URIs are normalized and compared according to the algorithm defined in [RFC3986], [Section 6](#), using the defaults described above for each scheme.

If the port is equal to the default port for a scheme, the normal form is to omit the port subcomponent. When not being used in absolute form as the request target of an OPTIONS request, an empty path component is equivalent to an absolute path of "/", so the normal form is to provide a path of "/" instead. The scheme and host are case-insensitive and normally provided in lowercase; all other components are compared in a case-sensitive manner. Characters other than those in the "reserved" set are equivalent to their percent-encoded octets (see [RFC3986], [Section 2.1](#)): the normal form is to not encode them.

For example, the following three URIs are equivalent:

```
http://example.com:80/~smith/home.html  
http://EXAMPLE.com/%7Esmith/home.html
```



<http://EXAMPLE.com:/%7esmith/home.html>

### 3. Message Format

All HTTP/1.1 messages consist of a start-line followed by a sequence of octets in a format similar to the Internet Message Format [RFC5322]: zero or more header fields (collectively referred to as the "headers" or the "header section"), an empty line indicating the end of the header section, and an optional message body.

```
HTTP-message = start-line
              *( header-field CRLF )
              CRLF
              [ message-body ]
```

The normal procedure for parsing an HTTP message is to read the start-line into a structure, read each header field into a hash table by field name until the empty line, and then use the parsed data to determine if a message body is expected. If a message body has been indicated, then it is read as a stream until an amount of octets equal to the message body length is read or the connection is closed.

Recipients MUST parse an HTTP message as a sequence of octets in an encoding that is a superset of US-ASCII [USASCII]. Parsing an HTTP message as a stream of Unicode characters, without regard for the specific encoding, creates security vulnerabilities due to the varying ways that string processing libraries handle invalid multibyte character sequences that contain the octet LF (%x0A). String-based parsers can only be safely used within protocol elements after the element has been extracted from the message, such as within a header field-value after message parsing has delineated the individual fields.

An HTTP message can be parsed as a stream for incremental processing or forwarding downstream. However, recipients cannot rely on incremental delivery of partial messages, since some implementations will buffer or delay message forwarding for the sake of network efficiency, security checks, or payload transformations.

A sender MUST NOT send whitespace between the start-line and the first header field. A recipient that receives whitespace between the start-line and the first header field MUST either reject the message as invalid or consume each whitespace-preceded line without further processing of it (i.e., ignore the entire line, along with any subsequent lines preceded by whitespace, until a properly formed header field is received or the header block is terminated).

The presence of such whitespace in a request might be an attempt to



trick a server into ignoring that field or processing the line after it as a new request, either of which might result in a security vulnerability if other implementations within the request chain interpret the same message differently. Likewise, the presence of such whitespace in a response might be ignored by some clients or cause others to cease parsing.

### **[3.1.](#) Start Line**

An HTTP message can either be a request from client to server or a response from server to client. Syntactically, the two types of message differ only in the start-line, which is either a request-line (for requests) or a status-line (for responses), and in the algorithm for determining the length of the message body ([Section 3.3](#)).

In theory, a client could receive requests and a server could receive responses, distinguishing them by their different start-line formats, but in practice servers are implemented to only expect a request (a response is interpreted as an unknown or invalid request method) and clients are implemented to only expect a response.

start-line = request-line / status-line

#### **[3.1.1.](#) Request Line**

A request-line begins with a method token, followed by a single space (SP), the request-target, another single space (SP), the protocol version, and ending with CRLF.

request-line = method SP request-target SP HTTP-version CRLF

The method token indicates the request method to be performed on the target resource. The request method is case-sensitive.

method = token

The methods defined by this specification can be found in Section 4 of [[Part2](#)], along with information regarding the HTTP method registry and considerations for defining new methods.

The request-target identifies the target resource upon which to apply the request, as defined in [Section 5.3](#).

Recipients typically parse the request-line into its component parts by splitting on whitespace (see [Section 3.5](#)), since no whitespace is allowed in the three components. Unfortunately, some user agents fail to properly encode or exclude whitespace found in hypertext references, resulting in those disallowed characters being sent in a



request-target.

Recipients of an invalid request-line SHOULD respond with either a 400 (Bad Request) error or a 301 (Moved Permanently) redirect with the request-target properly encoded. Recipients SHOULD NOT attempt to autocorrect and then process the request without a redirect, since the invalid request-line might be deliberately crafted to bypass security filters along the request chain.

HTTP does not place a pre-defined limit on the length of a request-line. A server that receives a method longer than any that it implements SHOULD respond with a 501 (Not Implemented) status code. A server MUST be prepared to receive URIs of unbounded length and respond with the 414 (URI Too Long) status code if the received request-target would be longer than the server wishes to handle (see Section 6.5.12 of [Part2]).

Various ad-hoc limitations on request-line length are found in practice. It is RECOMMENDED that all HTTP senders and recipients support, at a minimum, request-line lengths of 8000 octets.

### **3.1.2. Status Line**

The first line of a response message is the status-line, consisting of the protocol version, a space (SP), the status code, another space, a possibly-empty textual phrase describing the status code, and ending with CRLF.

status-line = HTTP-version SP status-code SP reason-phrase CRLF

The status-code element is a 3-digit integer code describing the result of the server's attempt to understand and satisfy the client's corresponding request. The rest of the response message is to be interpreted in light of the semantics defined for that status code. See Section 6 of [Part2] for information about the semantics of status codes, including the classes of status code (indicated by the first digit), the status codes defined by this specification, considerations for the definition of new status codes, and the IANA registry.

status-code = 3DIGIT

The reason-phrase element exists for the sole purpose of providing a textual description associated with the numeric status code, mostly out of deference to earlier Internet application protocols that were more frequently used with interactive text clients. A client SHOULD ignore the reason-phrase content.





```
reason-phrase = *( HTAB / SP / VCHAR / obs-text )
```

### 3.2. Header Fields

Each HTTP header field consists of a case-insensitive field name followed by a colon (":"), optional leading whitespace, the field value, and optional trailing whitespace.

```
header-field  = field-name ":" OWS field-value OWS
field-name    = token
field-value   = *( field-content / obs-fold )
field-content = *( HTAB / SP / VCHAR / obs-text )
obs-fold     = CRLF ( SP / HTAB )
              ; obsolete line folding
              ; see Section 3.2.4
```

The field-name token labels the corresponding field-value as having the semantics defined by that header field. For example, the Date header field is defined in Section 7.1.1.2 of [\[Part2\]](#) as containing the origination timestamp for the message in which it appears.

#### 3.2.1. Field Extensibility

HTTP header fields are fully extensible: there is no limit on the introduction of new field names, each presumably defining new semantics, nor on the number of header fields used in a given message. Existing fields are defined in each part of this specification and in many other specifications outside the core standard. New header fields can be introduced without changing the protocol version if their defined semantics allow them to be safely ignored by recipients that do not recognize them.

New HTTP header fields ought to be registered with IANA in the Message Header Field Registry, as described in Section 8.3 of [\[Part2\]](#). A proxy MUST forward unrecognized header fields unless the field-name is listed in the Connection header field ([Section 6.1](#)) or the proxy is specifically configured to block, or otherwise transform, such fields. Other recipients SHOULD ignore unrecognized header fields.

#### 3.2.2. Field Order

The order in which header fields with differing field names are received is not significant. However, it is "good practice" to send header fields that contain control data first, such as Host on requests and Date on responses, so that implementations can decide when not to handle a message as early as possible. A server MUST wait until the entire header section is received before interpreting



a request message, since later header fields might include conditionals, authentication credentials, or deliberately misleading duplicate header fields that would impact request processing.

A sender **MUST NOT** generate multiple header fields with the same field name in a message unless either the entire field value for that header field is defined as a comma-separated list [i.e., #(values)] or the header field is a well-known exception (as noted below).

Multiple header fields with the same field name can be combined into one "field-name: field-value" pair, without changing the semantics of the message, by appending each subsequent field value to the combined field value in order, separated by a comma. The order in which header fields with the same field name are received is therefore significant to the interpretation of the combined field value; a proxy **MUST NOT** change the order of these field values when forwarding a message.

Note: In practice, the "Set-Cookie" header field ([\[RFC6265\]](#)) often appears multiple times in a response message and does not use the list syntax, violating the above requirements on multiple header fields with the same name. Since it cannot be combined into a single field-value, recipients ought to handle "Set-Cookie" as a special case while processing header fields. (See [Appendix A.2.3](#) of [\[Kri2001\]](#) for details.)

### **[3.2.3.](#) Whitespace**

This specification uses three rules to denote the use of linear whitespace: OWS (optional whitespace), RWS (required whitespace), and BWS ("bad" whitespace).

The OWS rule is used where zero or more linear whitespace octets might appear. For protocol elements where optional whitespace is preferred to improve readability, a sender **SHOULD** generate the optional whitespace as a single SP; otherwise, a sender **SHOULD NOT** generate optional whitespace except as needed to white-out invalid or unwanted protocol elements during in-place message filtering.

The RWS rule is used when at least one linear whitespace octet is required to separate field tokens. A sender **SHOULD** generate RWS as a single SP.

The BWS rule is used where the grammar allows optional whitespace only for historical reasons. A sender **MUST NOT** generate BWS in messages. A recipient **MUST** parse for such bad whitespace and remove it before interpreting the protocol element.



```
OWS           = *( SP / HTAB )  
              ; optional whitespace  
RWS           = 1*( SP / HTAB )  
              ; required whitespace  
BWS           = OWS  
              ; "bad" whitespace
```

#### **[3.2.4.](#) Field Parsing**

No whitespace is allowed between the header field-name and colon. In the past, differences in the handling of such whitespace have led to security vulnerabilities in request routing and response handling. A server **MUST** reject any received request message that contains whitespace between a header field-name and colon with a response code of 400 (Bad Request). A proxy **MUST** remove any such whitespace from a response message before forwarding the message downstream.

A field value is preceded by optional whitespace (OWS); a single SP is preferred. The field value does not include any leading or trailing white space: OWS occurring before the first non-whitespace octet of the field value or after the last non-whitespace octet of the field value ought to be excluded by parsers when extracting the field value from a header field.

A recipient of field-content containing multiple sequential octets of optional (OWS) or required (RWS) whitespace **SHOULD** either replace the sequence with a single SP or transform any non-SP octets in the sequence to SP octets before interpreting the field value or forwarding the message downstream.

Historically, HTTP header field values could be extended over multiple lines by preceding each extra line with at least one space or horizontal tab (obs-fold). This specification deprecates such line folding except within the message/http media type ([Section 7.3.1](#)). Senders **MUST NOT** generate messages that include line folding (i.e., that contain any field-value that contains a match to the obs-fold rule) unless the message is intended for packaging within the message/http media type.

A server that receives an obs-fold in a request message that is not within a message/http container **MUST** either reject the message by sending a 400 (Bad Request), preferably with a representation explaining that obsolete line folding is unacceptable, or replace each received obs-fold with one or more SP octets prior to interpreting the field value or forwarding the message downstream.

A proxy or gateway that receives an obs-fold in a response message that is not within a message/http container **MUST** either discard the



message and replace it with a 502 (Bad Gateway) response, preferably with a representation explaining that unacceptable line folding was received, or replace each received obs-fold with one or more SP octets prior to interpreting the field value or forwarding the message downstream.

A user agent that receives an obs-fold in a response message that is not within a message/http container MUST replace each received obs-fold with one or more SP octets prior to interpreting the field value.

Historically, HTTP has allowed field content with text in the ISO-8859-1 [[ISO-8859-1](#)] charset, supporting other charsets only through use of [[RFC2047](#)] encoding. In practice, most HTTP header field values use only a subset of the US-ASCII charset [[USASCII](#)]. Newly defined header fields SHOULD limit their field values to US-ASCII octets. Recipients SHOULD treat other octets in field content (obs-text) as opaque data.

### **[3.2.5.](#) Field Limits**

HTTP does not place a pre-defined limit on the length of each header field or on the length of the header block as a whole. Various ad-hoc limitations on individual header field length are found in practice, often depending on the specific field semantics.

A server MUST be prepared to receive request header fields of unbounded length and respond with an appropriate 4xx (Client Error) status code if the received header field(s) are larger than the server wishes to process.

A client MUST be prepared to receive response header fields of unbounded length. A client MAY discard or truncate received header fields that are larger than the client wishes to process if the field semantics are such that the dropped value(s) can be safely ignored without changing the response semantics.

### **[3.2.6.](#) Field value components**

Many HTTP header field values consist of words (token or quoted-string) separated by whitespace or special characters. These special characters MUST be in a quoted string to be used within a parameter value (as defined in [Section 4](#)).





```

word           = token / quoted-string

token          = 1*tchar

tchar          = "!" / "#" / "$" / "%" / "&" / "'" / "*"
               / "+" / "-" / "." / "^" / "_" / "`" / "|" / "~"
               / DIGIT / ALPHA
               ; any VCHAR, except special

special        = "(" / ")" / "<" / ">" / "@" / ","
               / ";" / ":" / "\" / DQUOTE / "/" / "["
               / "]" / "?" / "=" / "{" / "}"

```

A string of text is parsed as a single word if it is quoted using double-quote marks.

```

quoted-string = DQUOTE *( qdtext / quoted-pair ) DQUOTE
qdtext       = HTAB / SP / %x21 / %x23-5B / %x5D-7E / obs-text
obs-text     = %x80-FF

```

The backslash octet ("\") can be used as a single-octet quoting mechanism within quoted-string constructs:

```

quoted-pair   = "\" ( HTAB / SP / VCHAR / obs-text )

```

Recipients that process the value of a quoted-string MUST handle a quoted-pair as if it were replaced by the octet following the backslash.

Senders SHOULD NOT generate a quoted-pair in a quoted-string except where necessary to quote DQUOTE and backslash octets occurring within that string.

Comments can be included in some HTTP header fields by surrounding the comment text with parentheses. Comments are only allowed in fields containing "comment" as part of their field value definition.

```

comment       = "(" *( ctext / quoted-cpair / comment ) ")"
ctext         = HTAB / SP / %x21-27 / %x2A-5B / %x5D-7E / obs-text

```

The backslash octet ("\") can be used as a single-octet quoting mechanism within comment constructs:

```

quoted-cpair  = "\" ( HTAB / SP / VCHAR / obs-text )

```

Senders SHOULD NOT escape octets in comments that do not require escaping (i.e., other than the backslash octet "\" and the parentheses "(" and ")").



### **3.3. Message Body**

The message body (if any) of an HTTP message is used to carry the payload body of that request or response. The message body is identical to the payload body unless a transfer coding has been applied, as described in [Section 3.3.1](#).

```
message-body = *OCTET
```

The rules for when a message body is allowed in a message differ for requests and responses.

The presence of a message body in a request is signaled by a Content-Length or Transfer-Encoding header field. Request message framing is independent of method semantics, even if the method does not define any use for a message body.

The presence of a message body in a response depends on both the request method to which it is responding and the response status code ([Section 3.1.2](#)). Responses to the HEAD request method never include a message body because the associated response header fields (e.g., Transfer-Encoding, Content-Length, etc.), if present, indicate only what their values would have been if the request method had been GET (Section 4.3.2 of [\[Part2\]](#)). 2xx (Successful) responses to CONNECT switch to tunnel mode instead of having a message body (Section 4.3.6 of [\[Part2\]](#)). All 1xx (Informational), 204 (No Content), and 304 (Not Modified) responses do not include a message body. All other responses do include a message body, although the body might be of zero length.

#### **3.3.1. Transfer-Encoding**

The Transfer-Encoding header field lists the transfer coding names corresponding to the sequence of transfer codings that have been (or will be) applied to the payload body in order to form the message body. Transfer codings are defined in [Section 4](#).

```
Transfer-Encoding = 1#transfer-coding
```

Transfer-Encoding is analogous to the Content-Transfer-Encoding field of MIME, which was designed to enable safe transport of binary data over a 7-bit transport service ([\[RFC2045\]](#), [Section 6](#)). However, safe transport has a different focus for an 8bit-clean transfer protocol. In HTTP's case, Transfer-Encoding is primarily intended to accurately delimit a dynamically generated payload and to distinguish payload encodings that are only applied for transport efficiency or security from those that are characteristics of the selected resource.



All HTTP/1.1 recipients MUST implement the chunked transfer coding ([Section 4.1](#)) because it plays a crucial role in framing messages when the payload body size is not known in advance. If chunked is applied to a payload body, the sender MUST NOT apply chunked more than once (i.e., chunking an already chunked message is not allowed). If any transfer coding is applied to a request payload body, the sender MUST apply chunked as the final transfer coding to ensure that the message is properly framed. If any transfer coding is applied to a response payload body, the sender MUST either apply chunked as the final transfer coding or terminate the message by closing the connection.

For example,

```
Transfer-Encoding: gzip, chunked
```

indicates that the payload body has been compressed using the gzip coding and then chunked using the chunked coding while forming the message body.

Unlike Content-Encoding (Section 3.1.2.1 of [\[Part2\]](#)), Transfer-Encoding is a property of the message, not of the representation, and any recipient along the request/response chain MAY decode the received transfer coding(s) or apply additional transfer coding(s) to the message body, assuming that corresponding changes are made to the Transfer-Encoding field-value. Additional information about the encoding parameters MAY be provided by other header fields not defined by this specification.

Transfer-Encoding MAY be sent in a response to a HEAD request or in a 304 (Not Modified) response (Section 4.1 of [\[Part4\]](#)) to a GET request, neither of which includes a message body, to indicate that the origin server would have applied a transfer coding to the message body if the request had been an unconditional GET. This indication is not required, however, because any recipient on the response chain (including the origin server) can remove transfer codings when they are not needed.

Transfer-Encoding was added in HTTP/1.1. It is generally assumed that implementations advertising only HTTP/1.0 support will not understand how to process a transfer-encoded payload. A client MUST NOT send a request containing Transfer-Encoding unless it knows the server will handle HTTP/1.1 (or later) requests; such knowledge might be in the form of specific user configuration or by remembering the version of a prior received response. A server MUST NOT send a response containing Transfer-Encoding unless the corresponding request indicates HTTP/1.1 (or later).



A server that receives a request message with a transfer coding it does not understand SHOULD respond with 501 (Not Implemented).

### **3.3.2. Content-Length**

When a message does not have a Transfer-Encoding header field, a Content-Length header field can provide the anticipated size, as a decimal number of octets, for a potential payload body. For messages that do include a payload body, the Content-Length field-value provides the framing information necessary for determining where the body (and message) ends. For messages that do not include a payload body, the Content-Length indicates the size of the selected representation (Section 3 of [Part2]).

Content-Length = 1\*DIGIT

An example is

Content-Length: 3495

A sender MUST NOT send a Content-Length header field in any message that contains a Transfer-Encoding header field.

A user agent SHOULD send a Content-Length in a request message when no Transfer-Encoding is sent and the request method defines a meaning for an enclosed payload body. For example, a Content-Length header field is normally sent in a POST request even when the value is 0 (indicating an empty payload body). A user agent SHOULD NOT send a Content-Length header field when the request message does not contain a payload body and the method semantics do not anticipate such a body.

A server MAY send a Content-Length header field in a response to a HEAD request (Section 4.3.2 of [Part2]); a server MUST NOT send Content-Length in such a response unless its field-value equals the decimal number of octets that would have been sent in the payload body of a response if the same request had used the GET method.

A server MAY send a Content-Length header field in a 304 (Not Modified) response to a conditional GET request (Section 4.1 of [Part4]); a server MUST NOT send Content-Length in such a response unless its field-value equals the decimal number of octets that would have been sent in the payload body of a 200 (OK) response to the same request.

A server MUST NOT send a Content-Length header field in any response with a status code of 1xx (Informational) or 204 (No Content). A server SHOULD NOT send a Content-Length header field in any 2xx





(Successful) response to a CONNECT request (Section 4.3.6 of [\[Part2\]](#)).

Aside from the cases defined above, in the absence of Transfer-Encoding, an origin server SHOULD send a Content-Length header field when the payload body size is known prior to sending the complete header block. This will allow downstream recipients to measure transfer progress, know when a received message is complete, and potentially reuse the connection for additional requests.

Any Content-Length field value greater than or equal to zero is valid. Since there is no predefined limit to the length of a payload, recipients SHOULD anticipate potentially large decimal numerals and prevent parsing errors due to integer conversion overflows ([Section 8.3](#)).

If a message is received that has multiple Content-Length header fields with field-values consisting of the same decimal value, or a single Content-Length header field with a field value containing a list of identical decimal values (e.g., "Content-Length: 42, 42"), indicating that duplicate Content-Length header fields have been generated or combined by an upstream message processor, then the recipient MUST either reject the message as invalid or replace the duplicated field-values with a single valid Content-Length field containing that decimal value prior to determining the message body length.

Note: HTTP's use of Content-Length for message framing differs significantly from the same field's use in MIME, where it is an optional field used only within the "message/external-body" media-type.

### **[3.3.3](#). Message Body Length**

The length of a message body is determined by one of the following (in order of precedence):

1. Any response to a HEAD request and any response with a 1xx (Informational), 204 (No Content), or 304 (Not Modified) status code is always terminated by the first empty line after the header fields, regardless of the header fields present in the message, and thus cannot contain a message body.
2. Any 2xx (Successful) response to a CONNECT request implies that the connection will become a tunnel immediately after the empty line that concludes the header fields. A client MUST ignore any Content-Length or Transfer-Encoding header fields received in such a message.



3. If a Transfer-Encoding header field is present and the chunked transfer coding ([Section 4.1](#)) is the final encoding, the message body length is determined by reading and decoding the chunked data until the transfer coding indicates the data is complete.

If a Transfer-Encoding header field is present in a response and the chunked transfer coding is not the final encoding, the message body length is determined by reading the connection until it is closed by the server. If a Transfer-Encoding header field is present in a request and the chunked transfer coding is not the final encoding, the message body length cannot be determined reliably; the server MUST respond with the 400 (Bad Request) status code and then close the connection.

If a message is received with both a Transfer-Encoding and a Content-Length header field, the Transfer-Encoding overrides the Content-Length. Such a message might indicate an attempt to perform request or response smuggling (bypass of security-related checks on message routing or content) and thus ought to be handled as an error. A sender MUST remove the received Content-Length field prior to forwarding such a message downstream.

4. If a message is received without Transfer-Encoding and with either multiple Content-Length header fields having differing field-values or a single Content-Length header field having an invalid value, then the message framing is invalid and MUST be treated as an error to prevent request or response smuggling. If this is a request message, the server MUST respond with a 400 (Bad Request) status code and then close the connection. If this is a response message received by a proxy, the proxy MUST close the connection to the server, discard the received response, and send a 502 (Bad Gateway) response to the client. If this is a response message received by a user agent, it MUST be treated as an error by discarding the message and closing the connection.
5. If a valid Content-Length header field is present without Transfer-Encoding, its decimal value defines the expected message body length in octets. If the sender closes the connection or the recipient times out before the indicated number of octets are received, the recipient MUST consider the message to be incomplete and close the connection.
6. If this is a request message and none of the above are true, then the message body length is zero (no message body is present).
7. Otherwise, this is a response message without a declared message body length, so the message body length is determined by the number of octets received prior to the server closing the



connection.

Since there is no way to distinguish a successfully completed, close-delimited message from a partially-received message interrupted by network failure, a server SHOULD use encoding or length-delimited messages whenever possible. The close-delimiting feature exists primarily for backwards compatibility with HTTP/1.0.

A server MAY reject a request that contains a message body but not a Content-Length by responding with 411 (Length Required).

Unless a transfer coding other than chunked has been applied, a client that sends a request containing a message body SHOULD use a valid Content-Length header field if the message body length is known in advance, rather than the chunked transfer coding, since some existing services respond to chunked with a 411 (Length Required) status code even though they understand the chunked transfer coding. This is typically because such services are implemented via a gateway that requires a content-length in advance of being called and the server is unable or unwilling to buffer the entire request before processing.

A user agent that sends a request containing a message body MUST send a valid Content-Length header field if it does not know the server will handle HTTP/1.1 (or later) requests; such knowledge can be in the form of specific user configuration or by remembering the version of a prior received response.

If the final response to the last request on a connection has been completely received and there remains additional data to read, a user agent MAY discard the remaining data or attempt to determine if that data belongs as part of the prior response body, which might be the case if the prior message's Content-Length value is incorrect. A client MUST NOT process, cache, or forward such extra data as a separate response, since such behavior would be vulnerable to cache poisoning.

#### **3.4. Handling Incomplete Messages**

A server that receives an incomplete request message, usually due to a canceled request or a triggered time-out exception, MAY send an error response prior to closing the connection.

A client that receives an incomplete response message, which can occur when a connection is closed prematurely or when decoding a supposedly chunked transfer coding fails, MUST record the message as incomplete. Cache requirements for incomplete responses are defined in Section 3 of [[Part6](#)].



If a response terminates in the middle of the header block (before the empty line is received) and the status code might rely on header fields to convey the full meaning of the response, then the client cannot assume that meaning has been conveyed; the client might need to repeat the request in order to determine what action to take next.

A message body that uses the chunked transfer coding is incomplete if the zero-sized chunk that terminates the encoding has not been received. A message that uses a valid Content-Length is incomplete if the size of the message body received (in octets) is less than the value given by Content-Length. A response that has neither chunked transfer coding nor Content-Length is terminated by closure of the connection, and thus is considered complete regardless of the number of message body octets received, provided that the header block was received intact.

### **3.5. Message Parsing Robustness**

Older HTTP/1.0 user agent implementations might send an extra CRLF after a POST request as a workaround for some early server applications that failed to read message body content that was not terminated by a line-ending. An HTTP/1.1 user agent **MUST NOT** preface or follow a request with an extra CRLF. If terminating the request message body with a line-ending is desired, then the user agent **MUST** count the terminating CRLF octets as part of the message body length.

In the interest of robustness, servers **SHOULD** ignore at least one empty line received where a request-line is expected. In other words, if a server is reading the protocol stream at the beginning of a message and receives a CRLF first, the server **SHOULD** ignore the CRLF.

Although the line terminator for the start-line and header fields is the sequence CRLF, recipients **MAY** recognize a single LF as a line terminator and ignore any preceding CR.

Although the request-line and status-line grammar rules require that each of the component elements be separated by a single SP octet, recipients **MAY** instead parse on whitespace-delimited word boundaries and, aside from the CRLF terminator, treat any form of whitespace as the SP separator while ignoring preceding or trailing whitespace; such whitespace includes one or more of the following octets: SP, HTAB, VT (%x0B), FF (%x0C), or bare CR.

When a server listening only for HTTP request messages, or processing what appears from the start-line to be an HTTP request message, receives a sequence of octets that does not match the HTTP-message grammar aside from the robustness exceptions listed above, the server





SHOULD respond with a 400 (Bad Request) response.

#### 4. Transfer Codings

Transfer coding names are used to indicate an encoding transformation that has been, can be, or might need to be applied to a payload body in order to ensure "safe transport" through the network. This differs from a content coding in that the transfer coding is a property of the message rather than a property of the representation that is being transferred.

```
transfer-coding    = "chunked" ; Section 4.1
                  / "compress" ; Section 4.2.1
                  / "deflate" ; Section 4.2.2
                  / "gzip" ; Section 4.2.3
                  / transfer-extension
transfer-extension = token *( OWS ";" OWS transfer-parameter )
```

Parameters are in the form of attribute/value pairs.

```
transfer-parameter = attribute BWS "=" BWS value
attribute          = token
value              = word
```

All transfer-coding names are case-insensitive and ought to be registered within the HTTP Transfer Coding registry, as defined in [Section 7.4](#). They are used in the TE ([Section 4.3](#)) and Transfer-Encoding ([Section 3.3.1](#)) header fields.

##### 4.1. Chunked Transfer Coding

The chunked transfer coding modifies the body of a message in order to transfer it as a series of chunks, each with its own size indicator, followed by an OPTIONAL trailer containing header fields. This allows dynamically generated content to be transferred along with the information necessary for the recipient to verify that it has received the full message.



```
chunked-body = *chunk
              last-chunk
              trailer-part
              CRLF

chunk         = chunk-size [ chunk-ext ] CRLF
              chunk-data CRLF

chunk-size   = 1*HEXDIG

last-chunk   = 1*("0") [ chunk-ext ] CRLF

chunk-ext    = *( ";" chunk-ext-name [ "=" chunk-ext-val ] )
chunk-ext-name = token
chunk-ext-val = token / quoted-str-nf
chunk-data   = 1*OCTET ; a sequence of chunk-size octets
trailer-part = *( header-field CRLF )

quoted-str-nf = DQUOTE *( qdtext-nf / quoted-pair ) DQUOTE
              ; like quoted-string, but disallowing line folding
qdtext-nf    = HTAB / SP / %x21 / %x23-5B / %x5D-7E / obs-text
```

Chunk extensions within the chunked transfer coding are deprecated. Senders SHOULD NOT send chunk-ext. Definition of new chunk extensions is discouraged.

The chunk-size field is a string of hex digits indicating the size of the chunk-data in octets. The chunked transfer coding is complete when a chunk with a chunk-size of zero is received, possibly followed by a trailer, and finally terminated by an empty line.

#### **4.1.1. Trailer**

A trailer allows the sender to include additional fields at the end of a chunked message in order to supply metadata that might be dynamically generated while the message body is sent, such as a message integrity check, digital signature, or post-processing status. The trailer MUST NOT contain fields that need to be known before a recipient processes the body, such as Transfer-Encoding, Content-Length, and Trailer.

When a message includes a message body encoded with the chunked transfer coding and the sender desires to send metadata in the form of trailer fields at the end of the message, the sender SHOULD send a Trailer header field before the message body to indicate which fields will be present in the trailers. This allows the recipient to prepare for receipt of that metadata before it starts processing the body, which is useful if the message is being streamed and the recipient wishes to confirm an integrity check on the fly.



Trailer = 1#field-name

If no Trailer header field is present, the sender of a chunked message body SHOULD send an empty trailer.

A server MUST send an empty trailer with the chunked transfer coding unless at least one of the following is true:

1. the request included a TE header field that indicates "trailers" is acceptable in the transfer coding of the response, as described in [Section 4.3](#); or,
2. the trailer fields consist entirely of optional metadata and the recipient could use the message (in a manner acceptable to the server where the field originated) without receiving that metadata. In other words, the server that generated the header field is willing to accept the possibility that the trailer fields might be silently discarded along the path to the client.

The above requirement prevents the need for an infinite buffer when a message is being received by an HTTP/1.1 (or later) proxy and forwarded to an HTTP/1.0 recipient.

#### **4.1.2. Decoding chunked**

A process for decoding the chunked transfer coding can be represented in pseudo-code as:

```
length := 0
read chunk-size, chunk-ext (if any), and CRLF
while (chunk-size > 0) {
    read chunk-data and CRLF
    append chunk-data to decoded-body
    length := length + chunk-size
    read chunk-size, chunk-ext (if any), and CRLF
}
read header-field
while (header-field not empty) {
    append header-field to existing header fields
    read header-field
}
Content-Length := length
Remove "chunked" from Transfer-Encoding
Remove Trailer from existing header fields
```

All recipients MUST be able to receive and decode the chunked transfer coding and MUST ignore chunk-ext extensions they do not understand.



## 4.2. Compression Codings

The codings defined below can be used to compress the payload of a message.

### 4.2.1. Compress Coding

The "compress" coding is an adaptive Lempel-Ziv-Welch (LZW) coding [[Welch](#)] that is commonly produced by the UNIX file compression program "compress". Recipients SHOULD consider "x-compress" to be equivalent to "compress".

### 4.2.2. Deflate Coding

The "deflate" coding is a "zlib" data format [[RFC1950](#)] containing a "deflate" compressed data stream [[RFC1951](#)] that uses a combination of the Lempel-Ziv (LZ77) compression algorithm and Huffman coding.

Note: Some incorrect implementations send the "deflate" compressed data without the zlib wrapper.

### 4.2.3. Gzip Coding

The "gzip" coding is an LZ77 coding with a 32 bit CRC that is commonly produced by the gzip file compression program [[RFC1952](#)]. Recipients SHOULD consider "x-gzip" to be equivalent to "gzip".

## 4.3. TE

The "TE" header field in a request indicates what transfer codings, besides chunked, the client is willing to accept in response, and whether or not the client is willing to accept trailer fields in a chunked transfer coding.

The TE field-value consists of a comma-separated list of transfer coding names, each allowing for optional parameters (as described in [Section 4](#)), and/or the keyword "trailers". Clients MUST NOT send the chunked transfer coding name in TE; chunked is always acceptable for HTTP/1.1 recipients.

```
TE           = #t-codings
t-codings   = "trailers" / ( transfer-coding [ t-ranking ] )
t-ranking   = OWS ";" OWS "q=" rank
rank        = ( "0" [ "." 0*3DIGIT ] )
              / ( "1" [ "." 0*3("0") ] )
```

Three examples of TE use are below.





```
TE: deflate
TE:
TE: trailers, deflate;q=0.5
```

The presence of the keyword "trailers" indicates that the client is willing to accept trailer fields in a chunked transfer coding, as defined in [Section 4.1](#), on behalf of itself and any downstream clients. For requests from an intermediary, this implies that either: (a) all downstream clients are willing to accept trailer fields in the forwarded response; or, (b) the intermediary will attempt to buffer the response on behalf of downstream recipients. Note that HTTP/1.1 does not define any means to limit the size of a chunked response such that an intermediary can be assured of buffering the entire response.

When multiple transfer codings are acceptable, the client MAY rank the codings by preference using a case-insensitive "q" parameter (similar to the qvalues used in content negotiation fields, [Section 5.3.1](#) of [Part2]). The rank value is a real number in the range 0 through 1, where 0.001 is the least preferred and 1 is the most preferred; a value of 0 means "not acceptable".

If the TE field-value is empty or if no TE field is present, the only acceptable transfer coding is chunked. A message with no transfer coding is always acceptable.

Since the TE header field only applies to the immediate connection, a sender of TE MUST also send a "TE" connection option within the Connection header field ([Section 6.1](#)) in order to prevent the TE field from being forwarded by intermediaries that do not support its semantics.

## 5. Message Routing

HTTP request message routing is determined by each client based on the target resource, the client's proxy configuration, and establishment or reuse of an inbound connection. The corresponding response routing follows the same connection chain back to the client.

### 5.1. Identifying a Target Resource

HTTP is used in a wide variety of applications, ranging from general-purpose computers to home appliances. In some cases, communication options are hard-coded in a client's configuration. However, most HTTP clients rely on the same resource identification mechanism and configuration techniques as general-purpose Web browsers.



HTTP communication is initiated by a user agent for some purpose. The purpose is a combination of request semantics, which are defined in [Part2], and a target resource upon which to apply those semantics. A URI reference ([Section 2.7](#)) is typically used as an identifier for the "target resource", which a user agent would resolve to its absolute form in order to obtain the "target URI". The target URI excludes the reference's fragment component, if any, since fragment identifiers are reserved for client-side processing ([RFC3986](#), [Section 3.5](#)).

## 5.2. Connecting Inbound

Once the target URI is determined, a client needs to decide whether a network request is necessary to accomplish the desired semantics and, if so, where that request is to be directed.

If the client has a cache [[Part6](#)] and the request can be satisfied by it, then the request is usually directed there first.

If the request is not satisfied by a cache, then a typical client will check its configuration to determine whether a proxy is to be used to satisfy the request. Proxy configuration is implementation-dependent, but is often based on URI prefix matching, selective authority matching, or both, and the proxy itself is usually identified by an "http" or "https" URI. If a proxy is applicable, the client connects inbound by establishing (or reusing) a connection to that proxy.

If no proxy is applicable, a typical client will invoke a handler routine, usually specific to the target URI's scheme, to connect directly to an authority for the target resource. How that is accomplished is dependent on the target URI scheme and defined by its associated specification, similar to how this specification defines origin server access for resolution of the "http" ([Section 2.7.1](#)) and "https" ([Section 2.7.2](#)) schemes.

HTTP requirements regarding connection management are defined in [Section 6](#).

## 5.3. Request Target

Once an inbound connection is obtained, the client sends an HTTP request message ([Section 3](#)) with a request-target derived from the target URI. There are four distinct formats for the request-target, depending on both the method being requested and whether the request is to a proxy.



```
request-target = origin-form
                / absolute-form
                / authority-form
                / asterisk-form

origin-form    = absolute-path [ "?" query ]
absolute-form  = absolute-URI
authority-form = authority
asterisk-form  = "*"

```

#### origin-form

The most common form of request-target is the origin-form. When making a request directly to an origin server, other than a CONNECT or server-wide OPTIONS request (as detailed below), a client MUST send only the absolute path and query components of the target URI as the request-target. If the target URI's path component is empty, then the client MUST send "/" as the path within the origin-form of request-target. A Host header field is also sent, as defined in [Section 5.4](#), containing the target URI's authority component (excluding any userinfo).

For example, a client wishing to retrieve a representation of the resource identified as

```
http://www.example.org/where?q=now
```

directly from the origin server would open (or reuse) a TCP connection to port 80 of the host "www.example.org" and send the lines:

```
GET /where?q=now HTTP/1.1
Host: www.example.org
```

followed by the remainder of the request message.

#### absolute-form

When making a request to a proxy, other than a CONNECT or server-wide OPTIONS request (as detailed below), a client MUST send the target URI in absolute-form as the request-target. The proxy is requested to either service that request from a valid cache, if possible, or make the same request on the client's behalf to either the next inbound proxy server or directly to the origin server indicated by the request-target. Requirements on such "forwarding" of messages are defined in [Section 5.7](#).

An example absolute-form of request-line would be:



```
GET http://www.example.org/pub/WWW/TheProject.html HTTP/1.1
```

To allow for transition to the absolute-form for all requests in some future version of HTTP, HTTP/1.1 servers MUST accept the absolute-form in requests, even though HTTP/1.1 clients will only send them in requests to proxies.

authority-form

The authority-form of request-target is only used for CONNECT requests (Section 4.3.6 of [Part2]). When making a CONNECT request to establish a tunnel through one or more proxies, a client MUST send only the target URI's authority component (excluding any userinfo) as the request-target. For example,

```
CONNECT www.example.com:80 HTTP/1.1
```

asterisk-form

The asterisk-form of request-target is only used for a server-wide OPTIONS request (Section 4.3.7 of [Part2]). When a client wishes to request OPTIONS for the server as a whole, as opposed to a specific named resource of that server, the client MUST send only "\*" (%x2A) as the request-target. For example,

```
OPTIONS * HTTP/1.1
```

If a proxy receives an OPTIONS request with an absolute-form of request-target in which the URI has an empty path and no query component, then the last proxy on the request chain MUST send a request-target of "\*" when it forwards the request to the indicated origin server.

For example, the request

```
OPTIONS http://www.example.org:8001 HTTP/1.1
```

would be forwarded by the final proxy as

```
OPTIONS * HTTP/1.1
Host: www.example.org:8001
```

after connecting to port 8001 of host "www.example.org".

#### **5.4. Host**

The "Host" header field in a request provides the host and port information from the target URI, enabling the origin server to





distinguish among resources while servicing requests for multiple host names on a single IP address. Since the Host field-value is critical information for handling a request, it SHOULD be sent as the first header field following the request-line.

Host = uri-host [ ":" port ] ; [Section 2.7.1](#)

A client MUST send a Host header field in all HTTP/1.1 request messages. If the target URI includes an authority component, then the Host field-value MUST be identical to that authority component after excluding any userinfo ([Section 2.7.1](#)). If the authority component is missing or undefined for the target URI, then the Host header field MUST be sent with an empty field-value.

For example, a GET request to the origin server for <http://www.example.org/pub/WWW/> would begin with:

```
GET /pub/WWW/ HTTP/1.1
Host: www.example.org
```

The Host header field MUST be sent in an HTTP/1.1 request even if the request-target is in the absolute-form, since this allows the Host information to be forwarded through ancient HTTP/1.0 proxies that might not have implemented Host.

When a proxy receives a request with an absolute-form of request-target, the proxy MUST ignore the received Host header field (if any) and instead replace it with the host information of the request-target. If the proxy forwards the request, it MUST generate a new Host field-value based on the received request-target rather than forward the received Host field-value.

Since the Host header field acts as an application-level routing mechanism, it is a frequent target for malware seeking to poison a shared cache or redirect a request to an unintended server. An interception proxy is particularly vulnerable if it relies on the Host field-value for redirecting requests to internal servers, or for use as a cache key in a shared cache, without first verifying that the intercepted connection is targeting a valid IP address for that host.

A server MUST respond with a 400 (Bad Request) status code to any HTTP/1.1 request message that lacks a Host header field and to any request message that contains more than one Host header field or a Host header field with an invalid field-value.



### **5.5. Effective Request URI**

A server that receives an HTTP request message MUST reconstruct the user agent's original target URI, based on the pieces of information learned from the request-target, Host header field, and connection context, in order to identify the intended target resource and properly service the request. The URI derived from this reconstruction process is referred to as the "effective request URI".

For a user agent, the effective request URI is the target URI.

If the request-target is in absolute-form, then the effective request URI is the same as the request-target. Otherwise, the effective request URI is constructed as follows.

If the request is received over a TLS-secured TCP connection, then the effective request URI's scheme is "https"; otherwise, the scheme is "http".

If the request-target is in authority-form, then the effective request URI's authority component is the same as the request-target. Otherwise, if a Host header field is supplied with a non-empty field-value, then the authority component is the same as the Host field-value. Otherwise, the authority component is the concatenation of the default host name configured for the server, a colon (":"), and the connection's incoming TCP port number in decimal form.

If the request-target is in authority-form or asterisk-form, then the effective request URI's combined path and query component is empty. Otherwise, the combined path and query component is the same as the request-target.

The components of the effective request URI, once determined as above, can be combined into absolute-URI form by concatenating the scheme, "://", authority, and combined path and query component.

Example 1: the following message received over an insecure TCP connection

```
GET /pub/WWW/TheProject.html HTTP/1.1
Host: www.example.org:8080
```

has an effective request URI of

<http://www.example.org:8080/pub/WWW/TheProject.html>



Example 2: the following message received over a TLS-secured TCP connection

```
OPTIONS * HTTP/1.1
Host: www.example.org
```

has an effective request URI of

```
https://www.example.org
```

An origin server that does not allow resources to differ by requested host MAY ignore the Host field-value and instead replace it with a configured server name when constructing the effective request URI.

Recipients of an HTTP/1.0 request that lacks a Host header field MAY attempt to use heuristics (e.g., examination of the URI path for something unique to a particular host) in order to guess the effective request URI's authority component.

## **5.6. Associating a Response to a Request**

HTTP does not include a request identifier for associating a given request message with its corresponding one or more response messages. Hence, it relies on the order of response arrival to correspond exactly to the order in which requests are made on the same connection. More than one response message per request only occurs when one or more informational responses (1xx, see Section 6.2 of [Part2]) precede a final response to the same request.

A client that has more than one outstanding request on a connection MUST maintain a list of outstanding requests in the order sent and MUST associate each received response message on that connection to the highest ordered request that has not yet received a final (non-1xx) response.

## **5.7. Message Forwarding**

As described in [Section 2.3](#), intermediaries can serve a variety of roles in the processing of HTTP requests and responses. Some intermediaries are used to improve performance or availability. Others are used for access control or to filter content. Since an HTTP stream has characteristics similar to a pipe-and-filter architecture, there are no inherent limits to the extent an intermediary can enhance (or interfere) with either direction of the stream.

Intermediaries that forward a message MUST implement the Connection header field, as specified in [Section 6.1](#), to exclude fields that are



only intended for the incoming connection.

In order to avoid request loops, a proxy that forwards requests to other proxies **MUST** be able to recognize and exclude all of its own server names, including any aliases, local variations, or literal IP addresses.

### 5.7.1. Via

The "Via" header field indicates the presence of intermediate protocols and recipients between the user agent and the server (on requests) or between the origin server and the client (on responses), similar to the "Received" header field in email ([Section 3.6.7 of \[RFC5322\]](#)). Via can be used for tracking message forwards, avoiding request loops, and identifying the protocol capabilities of senders along the request/response chain.

```
Via = 1#( received-protocol RWS received-by [ RWS comment ] )
```

```
received-protocol = [ protocol-name "/" ] protocol-version  
                  ; see Section 6.7  
received-by       = ( uri-host [ ":" port ] ) / pseudonym  
pseudonym         = token
```

Multiple Via field values represent each proxy or gateway that has forwarded the message. Each intermediary appends its own information about how the message was received, such that the end result is ordered according to the sequence of forwarding recipients.

A proxy **MUST** send an appropriate Via header field, as described below, in each message that it forwards. An HTTP-to-HTTP gateway **MUST** send an appropriate Via header field in each inbound request message and **MAY** send a Via header field in forwarded response messages.

For each intermediary, the received-protocol indicates the protocol and protocol version used by the upstream sender of the message. Hence, the Via field value records the advertised protocol capabilities of the request/response chain such that they remain visible to downstream recipients; this can be useful for determining what backwards-incompatible features might be safe to use in response, or within a later request, as described in [Section 2.6](#). For brevity, the protocol-name is omitted when the received protocol is HTTP.

The received-by field is normally the host and optional port number of a recipient server or client that subsequently forwarded the message. However, if the real host is considered to be sensitive





information, it MAY be replaced by a pseudonym. If the port is not given, it MAY be assumed to be the default port of the received-protocol.

Comments MAY be used in the Via header field to identify the software of each recipient, analogous to the User-Agent and Server header fields. However, all comments in the Via field are optional and MAY be removed by any recipient prior to forwarding the message.

For example, a request message could be sent from an HTTP/1.0 user agent to an internal proxy code-named "fred", which uses HTTP/1.1 to forward the request to a public proxy at p.example.net, which completes the request by forwarding it to the origin server at www.example.com. The request received by www.example.com would then have the following Via header field:

```
Via: 1.0 fred, 1.1 p.example.net
```

A proxy or gateway used as a portal through a network firewall SHOULD NOT forward the names and ports of hosts within the firewall region unless it is explicitly enabled to do so. If not enabled, the received-by host of any host behind the firewall SHOULD be replaced by an appropriate pseudonym for that host.

A proxy or gateway MAY combine an ordered subsequence of Via header field entries into a single such entry if the entries have identical received-protocol values. For example,

```
Via: 1.0 ricky, 1.1 ethel, 1.1 fred, 1.0 lucy
```

could be collapsed to

```
Via: 1.0 ricky, 1.1 mertz, 1.0 lucy
```

Senders SHOULD NOT combine multiple entries unless they are all under the same organizational control and the hosts have already been replaced by pseudonyms. Senders MUST NOT combine entries that have different received-protocol values.

### **5.7.2. Transformations**

Some intermediaries include features for transforming messages and their payloads. A transforming proxy might, for example, convert between image formats in order to save cache space or to reduce the amount of traffic on a slow link. However, operational problems might occur when these transformations are applied to payloads intended for critical applications, such as medical imaging or scientific data analysis, particularly when integrity checks or



digital signatures are used to ensure that the payload received is identical to the original.

If a proxy receives a request-target with a host name that is not a fully qualified domain name, it MAY add its own domain to the host name it received when forwarding the request. A proxy MUST NOT change the host name if it is a fully qualified domain name.

A proxy MUST NOT modify the "absolute-path" and "query" parts of the received request-target when forwarding it to the next inbound server, except as noted above to replace an empty path with "/" or "\*".

A proxy MUST NOT modify header fields that provide information about the end points of the communication chain, the resource state, or the selected representation. A proxy MAY change the message body through application or removal of a transfer coding ([Section 4](#)).

A non-transforming proxy MUST NOT modify the message payload ([Section 3.3](#) of [[Part2](#)]). A transforming proxy MUST NOT modify the payload of a message that contains the no-transform cache-control directive.

A transforming proxy MAY transform the payload of a message that does not contain the no-transform cache-control directive; if the payload is transformed, the transforming proxy MUST add a Warning header field with the warn-code of 214 ("Transformation Applied") if one does not already appear in the message (see [Section 7.5](#) of [[Part6](#)]). If the payload of a 200 (OK) response is transformed, the transforming proxy can also inform downstream recipients that a transformation has been applied by changing the response status code to 203 (Non-Authoritative Information) ([Section 6.3.4](#) of [[Part2](#)]).

## **6. Connection Management**

HTTP messaging is independent of the underlying transport or session-layer connection protocol(s). HTTP only presumes a reliable transport with in-order delivery of requests and the corresponding in-order delivery of responses. The mapping of HTTP request and response structures onto the data units of an underlying transport protocol is outside the scope of this specification.

As described in [Section 5.2](#), the specific connection protocols to be used for an HTTP interaction are determined by client configuration and the target URI. For example, the "http" URI scheme ([Section 2.7.1](#)) indicates a default connection of TCP over IP, with a default TCP port of 80, but the client might be configured to use a proxy via some other connection, port, or protocol.



HTTP implementations are expected to engage in connection management, which includes maintaining the state of current connections, establishing a new connection or reusing an existing connection, processing messages received on a connection, detecting connection failures, and closing each connection. Most clients maintain multiple connections in parallel, including more than one connection per server endpoint. Most servers are designed to maintain thousands of concurrent connections, while controlling request queues to enable fair use and detect denial of service attacks.

### **6.1. Connection**

The "Connection" header field allows the sender to indicate desired control options for the current connection. In order to avoid confusing downstream recipients, a proxy or gateway **MUST** remove or replace any received connection options before forwarding the message.

When a header field aside from Connection is used to supply control information for or about the current connection, the sender **MUST** list the corresponding field-name within the "Connection" header field. A proxy or gateway **MUST** parse a received Connection header field before a message is forwarded and, for each connection-option in this field, remove any header field(s) from the message with the same name as the connection-option, and then remove the Connection header field itself (or replace it with the intermediary's own connection options for the forwarded message).

Hence, the Connection header field provides a declarative way of distinguishing header fields that are only intended for the immediate recipient ("hop-by-hop") from those fields that are intended for all recipients on the chain ("end-to-end"), enabling the message to be self-descriptive and allowing future connection-specific extensions to be deployed without fear that they will be blindly forwarded by older intermediaries.

The Connection header field's value has the following grammar:

```
Connection          = 1#connection-option
connection-option = token
```

Connection options are case-insensitive.

A sender **MUST NOT** send a connection option corresponding to a header field that is intended for all recipients of the payload. For example, Cache-Control is never appropriate as a connection option (Section 7.2 of [\[Part6\]](#)).



The connection options do not have to correspond to a header field present in the message, since a connection-specific header field might not be needed if there are no parameters associated with that connection option. Recipients that trigger certain connection behavior based on the presence of connection options MUST do so based on the presence of the connection-option rather than only the presence of the optional header field. In other words, if the connection option is received as a header field but not indicated within the Connection field-value, then the recipient MUST ignore the connection-specific header field because it has likely been forwarded by an intermediary that is only partially conformant.

When defining new connection options, specifications ought to carefully consider existing deployed header fields and ensure that the new connection option does not share the same name as an unrelated header field that might already be deployed. Defining a new connection option essentially reserves that potential field-name for carrying additional information related to the connection option, since it would be unwise for senders to use that field-name for anything else.

The "close" connection option is defined for a sender to signal that this connection will be closed after completion of the response. For example,

```
Connection: close
```

in either the request or the response header fields indicates that the connection MUST be closed after the current request/response is complete ([Section 6.6](#)).

A client that does not support persistent connections MUST send the "close" connection option in every request message.

A server that does not support persistent connections MUST send the "close" connection option in every response message that does not have a 1xx (Informational) status code.

## **[6.2.](#) Establishment**

It is beyond the scope of this specification to describe how connections are established via various transport or session-layer protocols. Each connection applies to only one transport link.

## **[6.3.](#) Persistence**

HTTP/1.1 defaults to the use of "persistent connections", allowing multiple requests and responses to be carried over a single





connection. The "close" connection-option is used to signal that a connection will not persist after the current request/response. HTTP implementations SHOULD support persistent connections.

A recipient determines whether a connection is persistent or not based on the most recently received message's protocol version and Connection header field (if any):

- o If the close connection option is present, the connection will not persist after the current response; else,
- o If the received protocol is HTTP/1.1 (or later), the connection will persist after the current response; else,
- o If the received protocol is HTTP/1.0, the "keep-alive" connection option is present, the recipient is not a proxy, and the recipient wishes to honor the HTTP/1.0 "keep-alive" mechanism, the connection will persist after the current response; otherwise,
- o The connection will close after the current response.

A server MAY assume that an HTTP/1.1 client intends to maintain a persistent connection until a close connection option is received in a request.

A client MAY reuse a persistent connection until it sends or receives a close connection option or receives an HTTP/1.0 response without a "keep-alive" connection option.

In order to remain persistent, all messages on a connection MUST have a self-defined message length (i.e., one not defined by closure of the connection), as described in [Section 3.3](#). A server MUST read the entire request message body or close the connection after sending its response, since otherwise the remaining data on a persistent connection would be misinterpreted as the next request. Likewise, a client MUST read the entire response message body if it intends to reuse the same connection for a subsequent request.

A proxy server MUST NOT maintain a persistent connection with an HTTP/1.0 client (see [Section 19.7.1 of \[RFC2068\]](#) for information and discussion of the problems with the Keep-Alive header field implemented by many HTTP/1.0 clients).

Clients and servers SHOULD NOT assume that a persistent connection is maintained for HTTP versions less than 1.1 unless it is explicitly signaled. See [Appendix A.1.2](#) for more information on backward compatibility with HTTP/1.0 clients.



### **6.3.1. Retrying Requests**

Connections can be closed at any time, with or without intention. Implementations ought to anticipate the need to recover from asynchronous close events.

When an inbound connection is closed prematurely, a client MAY open a new connection and automatically retransmit an aborted sequence of requests if all of those requests have idempotent methods ([Section 4.2.2](#) of [\[Part2\]](#)). A proxy MUST NOT automatically retry non-idempotent requests.

A user agent MUST NOT automatically retry a request with a non-idempotent method unless it has some means to know that the request semantics are actually idempotent, regardless of the method, or some means to detect that the original request was never applied. For example, a user agent that knows (through design or configuration) that a POST request to a given resource is safe can repeat that request automatically. Likewise, a user agent designed specifically to operate on a version control repository might be able to recover from partial failure conditions by checking the target resource revision(s) after a failed connection, reverting or fixing any changes that were partially applied, and then automatically retrying the requests that failed.

An automatic retry SHOULD NOT be repeated if it fails.

### **6.3.2. Pipelining**

A client that supports persistent connections MAY "pipeline" its requests (i.e., send multiple requests without waiting for each response). A server MAY process a sequence of pipelined requests in parallel if they all have safe methods ([Section 4.2.1](#) of [\[Part2\]](#)), but MUST send the corresponding responses in the same order that the requests were received.

A client that pipelines requests MUST be prepared to retry those requests if the connection closes before it receives all of the corresponding responses. A client that assumes a persistent connection and pipelines immediately after connection establishment MUST NOT pipeline on a retry connection until it knows the connection is persistent.

Idempotent methods ([Section 4.2.2](#) of [\[Part2\]](#)) are significant to pipelining because they can be automatically retried after a connection failure. A user agent SHOULD NOT pipeline requests after a non-idempotent method until the final response status code for that method has been received, unless the user agent has a means to detect



and recover from partial failure conditions involving the pipelined sequence.

An intermediary that receives pipelined requests MAY pipeline those requests when forwarding them inbound, since it can rely on the outbound user agent(s) to determine what requests can be safely pipelined. If the inbound connection fails before receiving a response, the pipelining intermediary MAY attempt to retry a sequence of requests that have yet to receive a response if the requests all have idempotent methods; otherwise, the pipelining intermediary SHOULD forward any received responses and then close the corresponding outbound connection(s) so that the outbound user agent(s) can recover accordingly.

#### **6.4. Concurrency**

Clients SHOULD limit the number of simultaneous connections that they maintain to a given server.

Previous revisions of HTTP gave a specific number of connections as a ceiling, but this was found to be impractical for many applications. As a result, this specification does not mandate a particular maximum number of connections, but instead encourages clients to be conservative when opening multiple connections.

Multiple connections are typically used to avoid the "head-of-line blocking" problem, wherein a request that takes significant server-side processing and/or has a large payload blocks subsequent requests on the same connection. However, each connection consumes server resources. Furthermore, using multiple connections can cause undesirable side effects in congested networks.

Note that servers might reject traffic that they deem abusive, including an excessive number of connections from a client.

#### **6.5. Failures and Time-outs**

Servers will usually have some time-out value beyond which they will no longer maintain an inactive connection. Proxy servers might make this a higher value since it is likely that the client will be making more connections through the same server. The use of persistent connections places no requirements on the length (or existence) of this time-out for either the client or the server.

When a client or server wishes to time-out it SHOULD issue a graceful close on the transport connection. Clients and servers SHOULD both constantly watch for the other side of the transport close, and respond to it as appropriate. If a client or server does not detect



the other side's close promptly it could cause unnecessary resource drain on the network.

A client, server, or proxy MAY close the transport connection at any time. For example, a client might have started to send a new request at the same time that the server has decided to close the "idle" connection. From the server's point of view, the connection is being closed while it was idle, but from the client's point of view, a request is in progress.

Servers SHOULD maintain persistent connections and allow the underlying transport's flow control mechanisms to resolve temporary overloads, rather than terminate connections with the expectation that clients will retry. The latter technique can exacerbate network congestion.

A client sending a message body SHOULD monitor the network connection for an error response while it is transmitting the request. If the client sees an error response, it SHOULD immediately cease transmitting the body and close the connection.

#### **6.6. Tear-down**

The Connection header field ([Section 6.1](#)) provides a "close" connection option that a sender SHOULD send when it wishes to close the connection after the current request/response pair.

A client that sends a close connection option MUST NOT send further requests on that connection (after the one containing close) and MUST close the connection after reading the final response message corresponding to this request.

A server that receives a close connection option MUST initiate a close of the connection (see below) after it sends the final response to the request that contained close. The server SHOULD send a close connection option in its final response on that connection. The server MUST NOT process any further requests received on that connection.

A server that sends a close connection option MUST initiate a close of the connection (see below) after it sends the response containing close. The server MUST NOT process any further requests received on that connection.

A client that receives a close connection option MUST cease sending requests on that connection and close the connection after reading the response message containing the close; if additional pipelined requests had been sent on the connection, the client SHOULD NOT





assume that they will be processed by the server.

If a server performs an immediate close of a TCP connection, there is a significant risk that the client will not be able to read the last HTTP response. If the server receives additional data from the client on a fully-closed connection, such as another request that was sent by the client before receiving the server's response, the server's TCP stack will send a reset packet to the client; unfortunately, the reset packet might erase the client's unacknowledged input buffers before they can be read and interpreted by the client's HTTP parser.

To avoid the TCP reset problem, servers typically close a connection in stages. First, the server performs a half-close by closing only the write side of the read/write connection. The server then continues to read from the connection until it receives a corresponding close by the client, or until the server is reasonably certain that its own TCP stack has received the client's acknowledgement of the packet(s) containing the server's last response. Finally, the server fully closes the connection.

It is unknown whether the reset problem is exclusive to TCP or might also be found in other transport connection protocols.

### **6.7. Upgrade**

The "Upgrade" header field is intended to provide a simple mechanism for transitioning from HTTP/1.1 to some other protocol on the same connection. A client MAY send a list of protocols in the Upgrade header field of a request to invite the server to switch to one or more of those protocols, in order of descending preference, before sending the final response. A server MAY ignore a received Upgrade header field if it wishes to continue using the current protocol on that connection.

```
Upgrade           = 1#protocol
protocol          = protocol-name ["/" protocol-version]
protocol-name     = token
protocol-version  = token
```

A server that sends a 101 (Switching Protocols) response MUST send an Upgrade header field to indicate the new protocol(s) to which the connection is being switched; if multiple protocol layers are being switched, the new protocols MUST be listed in layer-ascending order. A server MUST NOT switch to a protocol that was not indicated by the client in the corresponding request's Upgrade header field. A server MAY choose to ignore the order of preference indicated by the client



and select the new protocol(s) based on other factors, such as the nature of the request or the current load on the server.

A server that sends a 426 (Upgrade Required) response MUST send an Upgrade header field to indicate the acceptable protocols, in order of descending preference.

A server MAY send an Upgrade header field in any other response to advertise that it implements support for upgrading to the listed protocols, in order of descending preference, when appropriate for a future request.

The following is a hypothetical example sent by a client:

```
GET /hello.txt HTTP/1.1
Host: www.example.com
Connection: upgrade
Upgrade: HTTP/2.0, SHTTP/1.3, IRC/6.9, RTA/x11
```

Upgrade cannot be used to insist on a protocol change; its acceptance and use by the server is optional. The capabilities and nature of the application-level communication after the protocol change is entirely dependent upon the new protocol(s) chosen, although the first action after changing the protocol MUST be a response to the initial HTTP request that contained the Upgrade header field.

For example, if the Upgrade header field is received in a GET request and the server decides to switch protocols, it first responds with a 101 (Switching Protocols) message in HTTP/1.1 and then immediately follows that with the new protocol's equivalent of a response to a GET on the target resource. This allows a connection to be upgraded to protocols with the same semantics as HTTP without the latency cost of an additional round-trip. A server MUST NOT switch protocols unless the received message semantics can be honored by the new protocol; an OPTIONS request can be honored by any protocol.

The following is an example response to the above hypothetical request:

```
HTTP/1.1 101 Switching Protocols
Connection: upgrade
Upgrade: HTTP/2.0
```

[... data stream switches to HTTP/2.0 with an appropriate response (as defined by new protocol) to the "GET /hello.txt" request ...]

When Upgrade is sent, the sender MUST also send a Connection header



field ([Section 6.1](#)) that contains an "upgrade" connection option, in order to prevent Upgrade from being accidentally forwarded by intermediaries that might not implement the listed protocols. A server MUST ignore an Upgrade header field that is received in an HTTP/1.0 request.

The Upgrade header field only applies to switching protocols on top of the existing connection; it cannot be used to switch the underlying connection (transport) protocol, nor to switch the existing communication to a different connection. For those purposes, it is more appropriate to use a 3xx (Redirection) response (Section 6.4 of [\[Part2\]](#)).

This specification only defines the protocol name "HTTP" for use by the family of Hypertext Transfer Protocols, as defined by the HTTP version rules of [Section 2.6](#) and future updates to this specification. Additional tokens ought to be registered with IANA using the registration procedure defined in [Section 7.5](#).

## 7. IANA Considerations

### 7.1. Header Field Registration

HTTP header fields are registered within the Message Header Field Registry maintained at <http://www.iana.org/assignments/message-headers/message-header-index.html>.

This document defines the following HTTP header fields, so their associated registry entries shall be updated according to the permanent registrations below (see [\[BCP90\]](#)):

Header Field Name	Protocol	Status	Reference
Connection	http	standard	<a href="#">Section 6.1</a>
Content-Length	http	standard	<a href="#">Section 3.3.2</a>
Host	http	standard	<a href="#">Section 5.4</a>
TE	http	standard	<a href="#">Section 4.3</a>
Trailer	http	standard	<a href="#">Section 4.1.1</a>
Transfer-Encoding	http	standard	<a href="#">Section 3.3.1</a>
Upgrade	http	standard	<a href="#">Section 6.7</a>
Via	http	standard	<a href="#">Section 5.7.1</a>

Furthermore, the header field-name "Close" shall be registered as "reserved", since using that name as an HTTP header field might conflict with the "close" connection option of the "Connection" header field ([Section 6.1](#)).



Header Field Name	Protocol	Status	Reference
Close	http	reserved	<a href="#">Section 7.1</a>

The change controller is: "IETF (iesg@ietf.org) - Internet Engineering Task Force".

### 7.2. URI Scheme Registration

IANA maintains the registry of URI Schemes [[BCP115](#)] at <http://www.iana.org/assignments/uri-schemes.html>.

This document defines the following URI schemes, so their associated registry entries shall be updated according to the permanent registrations below:

URI Scheme	Description	Reference
http	Hypertext Transfer Protocol	<a href="#">Section 2.7.1</a>
https	Hypertext Transfer Protocol Secure	<a href="#">Section 2.7.2</a>

### 7.3. Internet Media Type Registration

This document serves as the specification for the Internet media types "message/http" and "application/http". The following is to be registered with IANA (see [[BCP13](#)]).

#### 7.3.1. Internet Media Type message/http

The message/http type can be used to enclose a single HTTP request or response message, provided that it obeys the MIME restrictions for all "message" types regarding line length and encodings.

Type name: message

Subtype name: http

Required parameters: none

Optional parameters: version, msgtype





version: The HTTP-version number of the enclosed message (e.g., "1.1"). If not present, the version can be determined from the first line of the body.

msgtype: The message type -- "request" or "response". If not present, the type can be determined from the first line of the body.

Encoding considerations: only "7bit", "8bit", or "binary" are permitted

Security considerations: none

Interoperability considerations: none

Published specification: This specification (see [Section 7.3.1](#)).

Applications that use this media type:

Additional information:

Magic number(s): none

File extension(s): none

Macintosh file type code(s): none

Person and email address to contact for further information: See Authors Section.

Intended usage: COMMON

Restrictions on usage: none

Author: See Authors Section.

Change controller: IESG

### **[7.3.2](#). Internet Media Type application/http**

The application/http type can be used to enclose a pipeline of one or more HTTP request or response messages (not intermixed).

Type name: application



Subtype name: http

Required parameters: none

Optional parameters: version, msgtype

version: The HTTP-version number of the enclosed messages (e.g., "1.1"). If not present, the version can be determined from the first line of the body.

msgtype: The message type -- "request" or "response". If not present, the type can be determined from the first line of the body.

Encoding considerations: HTTP messages enclosed by this type are in "binary" format; use of an appropriate Content-Transfer-Encoding is required when transmitted via E-mail.

Security considerations: none

Interoperability considerations: none

Published specification: This specification (see [Section 7.3.2](#)).

Applications that use this media type:

Additional information:

Magic number(s): none

File extension(s): none

Macintosh file type code(s): none

Person and email address to contact for further information: See Authors Section.

Intended usage: COMMON

Restrictions on usage: none

Author: See Authors Section.

Change controller: IESG



### 7.4. Transfer Coding Registry

The HTTP Transfer Coding Registry defines the name space for transfer coding names. It is maintained at <http://www.iana.org/assignments/http-parameters>.

#### 7.4.1. Procedure

Registrations MUST include the following fields:

- o Name
- o Description
- o Pointer to specification text

Names of transfer codings MUST NOT overlap with names of content codings (Section 3.1.2.1 of [Part2]) unless the encoding transformation is identical, as is the case for the compression codings defined in Section 4.2.

Values to be added to this name space require IETF Review (see Section 4.1 of [RFC5226]), and MUST conform to the purpose of transfer coding defined in this specification.

Use of program names for the identification of encoding formats is not desirable and is discouraged for future encodings.

#### 7.4.2. Registration

The HTTP Transfer Coding Registry shall be updated with the registrations below:

Name	Description	Reference
chunked	Transfer in a series of chunks	<a href="#">Section 4.1</a>
compress	UNIX "compress" data format [Welch]	<a href="#">Section 4.2.1</a>
deflate	"deflate" compressed data ([RFC1951]) inside the "zlib" data format ([RFC1950])	<a href="#">Section 4.2.2</a>
gzip	GZIP file format [RFC1952]	<a href="#">Section 4.2.3</a>
x-compress	Deprecated (alias for compress)	<a href="#">Section 4.2.1</a>
x-gzip	Deprecated (alias for gzip)	<a href="#">Section 4.2.3</a>



## **7.5. Upgrade Token Registry**

The HTTP Upgrade Token Registry defines the name space for protocol-name tokens used to identify protocols in the Upgrade header field. The registry is maintained at <http://www.iana.org/assignments/http-upgrade-tokens>.

### **7.5.1. Procedure**

Each registered protocol name is associated with contact information and an optional set of specifications that details how the connection will be processed after it has been upgraded.

Registrations happen on a "First Come First Served" basis (see [Section 4.1 of \[RFC5226\]](#)) and are subject to the following rules:

1. A protocol-name token, once registered, stays registered forever.
2. The registration MUST name a responsible party for the registration.
3. The registration MUST name a point of contact.
4. The registration MAY name a set of specifications associated with that token. Such specifications need not be publicly available.
5. The registration SHOULD name a set of expected "protocol-version" tokens associated with that token at the time of registration.
6. The responsible party MAY change the registration at any time. The IANA will keep a record of all such changes, and make them available upon request.
7. The IESG MAY reassign responsibility for a protocol token. This will normally only be used in the case when a responsible party cannot be contacted.

This registration procedure for HTTP Upgrade Tokens replaces that previously defined in [Section 7.2 of \[RFC2817\]](#).

### **7.5.2. Upgrade Token Registration**

The HTTP Upgrade Token Registry shall be updated with the registration below:





Value	Description	Expected Version Tokens	Reference
HTTP	Hypertext Transfer Protocol	any DIGIT.DIGIT (e.g, "2.0")	<a href="#">Section 2.6</a>

The responsible party is: "IETF (iesg@ietf.org) - Internet Engineering Task Force".

## 8. Security Considerations

This section is meant to inform developers, information providers, and users of known security concerns relevant to HTTP/1.1 message syntax, parsing, and routing.

### 8.1. DNS-related Attacks

HTTP clients rely heavily on the Domain Name Service (DNS), and are thus generally prone to security attacks based on the deliberate misassociation of IP addresses and DNS names not protected by DNSSEC. Clients need to be cautious in assuming the validity of an IP number/DNS name association unless the response is protected by DNSSEC ([[RFC4033](#)]).

### 8.2. Intermediaries and Caching

By their very nature, HTTP intermediaries are men-in-the-middle, and represent an opportunity for man-in-the-middle attacks. Compromise of the systems on which the intermediaries run can result in serious security and privacy problems. Intermediaries have access to security-related information, personal information about individual users and organizations, and proprietary information belonging to users and content providers. A compromised intermediary, or an intermediary implemented or configured without regard to security and privacy considerations, might be used in the commission of a wide range of potential attacks.

Intermediaries that contain a shared cache are especially vulnerable to cache poisoning attacks.

Implementers need to consider the privacy and security implications of their design and coding decisions, and of the configuration options they provide to operators (especially the default configuration).

Users need to be aware that intermediaries are no more trustworthy



than the people who run them; HTTP itself cannot solve this problem.

### **8.3. Buffer Overflows**

Because HTTP uses mostly textual, character-delimited fields, attackers can overflow buffers in implementations, and/or perform a Denial of Service against implementations that accept fields with unlimited lengths.

To promote interoperability, this specification makes specific recommendations for minimum size limits on request-line ([Section 3.1.1](#)) and blocks of header fields ([Section 3.2](#)). These are minimum recommendations, chosen to be supportable even by implementations with limited resources; it is expected that most implementations will choose substantially higher limits.

This specification also provides a way for servers to reject messages that have request-targets that are too long ([Section 6.5.12](#) of [\[Part2\]](#)) or request entities that are too large ([Section 6.5](#) of [\[Part2\]](#)). Additional status codes related to capacity limits have been defined by extensions to HTTP [[RFC6585](#)].

Recipients SHOULD carefully limit the extent to which they read other fields, including (but not limited to) request methods, response status phrases, header field-names, and body chunks, so as to avoid denial of service attacks without impeding interoperability.

### **8.4. Message Integrity**

HTTP does not define a specific mechanism for ensuring message integrity, instead relying on the error-detection ability of underlying transport protocols and the use of length or chunk-delimited framing to detect completeness. Additional integrity mechanisms, such as hash functions or digital signatures applied to the content, can be selectively added to messages via extensible metadata header fields. Historically, the lack of a single integrity mechanism has been justified by the informal nature of most HTTP communication. However, the prevalence of HTTP as an information access mechanism has resulted in its increasing use within environments where verification of message integrity is crucial.

User agents are encouraged to implement configurable means for detecting and reporting failures of message integrity such that those means can be enabled within environments for which integrity is necessary. For example, a browser being used to view medical history or drug interaction information needs to indicate to the user when such information is detected by the protocol to be incomplete, expired, or corrupted during transfer. Such mechanisms might be



selectively enabled via user agent extensions or the presence of message integrity metadata in a response. At a minimum, user agents ought to provide some indication that allows a user to distinguish between a complete and incomplete response message ([Section 3.4](#)) when such verification is desired.

### **8.5. Server Log Information**

A server is in the position to save personal data about a user's requests over time, which might identify their reading patterns or subjects of interest. In particular, log information gathered at an intermediary often contains a history of user agent interaction, across a multitude of sites, that can be traced to individual users.

HTTP log information is confidential in nature; its handling is often constrained by laws and regulations. Log information needs to be securely stored and appropriate guidelines followed for its analysis. Anonymization of personal information within individual entries helps, but is generally not sufficient to prevent real log traces from being re-identified based on correlation with other access characteristics. As such, access traces that are keyed to a specific client should not be published even if the key is pseudonymous.

To minimize the risk of theft or accidental publication, log information should be purged of personally identifiable information, including user identifiers, IP addresses, and user-provided query parameters, as soon as that information is no longer necessary to support operational needs for security, auditing, or fraud control.

## **9. Acknowledgments**

This edition of HTTP/1.1 builds on the many contributions that went into [RFC 1945](#), [RFC 2068](#), [RFC 2145](#), and [RFC 2616](#), including substantial contributions made by the previous authors, editors, and working group chairs: Tim Berners-Lee, Ari Luotonen, Roy T. Fielding, Henrik Frystyk Nielsen, Jim Gettys, Jeffrey C. Mogul, Larry Masinter, and Paul J. Leach. Mark Nottingham oversaw this effort as working group chair.

Since 1999, the following contributors have helped improve the HTTP specification by reporting bugs, asking smart questions, drafting or reviewing text, and evaluating open issues:

Adam Barth, Adam Roach, Addison Phillips, Adrian Chadd, Adrien W. de Croy, Alan Ford, Alan Rittenberg, Albert Lunde, Alek Storm, Alex Rousskov, Alexandre Morgaut, Alexey Melnikov, Alisha Smith, Amichai Rothman, Amit Klein, Amos Jeffries, Andreas Maier, Andreas Petersson, Anil Sharma, Anne van Kesteren, Anthony Bryan, Asbjorn Ulsberg, Ashok



Kumar, Balachander Krishnamurthy, Barry Leiba, Ben Laurie, Benjamin Carlyle, Benjamin Niven-Jenkins, Bil Corry, Bill Burke, Bjoern Hoehrmann, Bob Scheifler, Boris Zbarsky, Brett Slatkin, Brian Kell, Brian McBarron, Brian Pane, Brian Raymor, Brian Smith, Bryce Nesbitt, Cameron Heaven-Jones, Carl Kugler, Carsten Bormann, Charles Fry, Chris Newman, Cyrus Daboo, Dale Robert Anderson, Dan Wing, Dan Winship, Daniel Stenberg, Darrel Miller, Dave Cridland, Dave Crocker, Dave Kristol, Dave Thaler, David Booth, David Singer, David W. Morris, Diwakar Shetty, Dmitry Kurochkin, Drummond Reed, Duane Wessels, Edward Lee, Eitan Adler, Eliot Lear, Eran Hammer-Lahav, Eric D. Williams, Eric J. Bowman, Eric Lawrence, Eric Rescorla, Erik Aronesty, Evan Prodromou, Felix Geisendoerfer, Florian Weimer, Frank Ellermann, Fred Akalin, Fred Bohle, Frederic Kayser, Gabor Molnar, Gabriel Montenegro, Geoffrey Sneddon, Gervase Markham, Gili Tzabari, Grahame Grieve, Greg Wilkins, Grzegorz Calkowski, Harald Tveit Alvestrand, Harry Halpin, Helge Hess, Henrik Nordstrom, Henry S. Thompson, Henry Story, Herbert van de Sompel, Herve Ruellan, Howard Melman, Hugo Haas, Ian Fette, Ian Hickson, Ido Safruti, Ilari Liusvaara, Ilya Grigorik, Ingo Struck, J. Ross Nicoll, James Cloos, James H. Manger, James Lacey, James M. Snell, Jamie Lokier, Jan Algermissen, Jeff Hodges (who came up with the term 'effective Request-URI'), Jeff Pinner, Jeff Walden, Jim Luther, Jitu Padhye, Joe D. Williams, Joe Gregorio, Joe Orton, John C. Klensin, John C. Mallery, John Cowan, John Kemp, John Panzer, John Schneider, John Stracke, John Sullivan, Jonas Sicking, Jonathan A. Rees, Jonathan Billington, Jonathan Moore, Jonathan Silvera, Jordi Ros, Joris Dobbelsteen, Josh Cohen, Julien Pierre, Jungshik Shin, Justin Chapweske, Justin Erenkrantz, Justin James, Kalvinder Singh, Karl Dubost, Keith Hoffman, Keith Moore, Ken Murchison, Koen Holtman, Konstantin Voronkov, Kris Zyp, Lisa Dusseault, Maciej Stachowiak, Manu Sporny, Marc Schneider, Marc Slemko, Mark Baker, Mark Pauley, Mark Watson, Markus Isomaki, Markus Lanthaler, Martin J. Duerst, Martin Musatov, Martin Nilsson, Martin Thomson, Matt Lynch, Matthew Cox, Max Clark, Michael Burrows, Michael Hausenblas, Michael Sweet, Mike Amundsen, Mike Belshe, Mike Bishop, Mike Kelly, Mike Schinkel, Miles Sabin, Murray S. Kucherawy, Mykyta Yevstifeyev, Nathan Rixham, Nicholas Shanks, Nico Williams, Nicolas Alvarez, Nicolas Mailhot, Noah Slater, Osama Mazahir, Pablo Castro, Pat Hayes, Patrick R. McManus, Paul E. Jones, Paul Hoffman, Paul Marquess, Peter Lepeska, Peter Occil, Peter Saint-Andre, Peter Watkins, Phil Archer, Philippe Mouglin, Phillip Hallam-Baker, Piotr Dobrogost, Poul-Henning Kamp, Preethi Natarajan, Rajeev Bector, Ray Polk, Reto Bachmann-Gmuer, Richard Cyganiak, Robby Simpson, Robert Brewer, Robert Collins, Robert Mattson, Robert O'Callahan, Robert Olofsson, Robert Sayre, Robert Siemer, Robert de Wilde, Roberto Javier Godoy, Roberto Peon, Roland Zink, Ronny Widjaja, S. Mike Dierken, Salvatore Loreto, Sam Johnston, Sam Pullara, Sam Ruby, Scott Lawrence (who maintained the original issues list), Sean B. Palmer, Shane McCarron, Shigeki Ohtsu,





Stefan Eissing, Stefan Tilkov, Stefanos Harhalakis, Stephane Bortzmeyer, Stephen Farrell, Stephen Ludin, Stuart Williams, Subbu Allamaraju, Sylvain Hellegouarch, Tapan Divekar, Tatsuya Hayashi, Ted Hardie, Thomas Broyer, Thomas Fossati, Thomas Maslen, Thomas Nordin, Thomas Roessler, Tim Bray, Tim Morgan, Tim Olsen, Tom Zhou, Travis Snoozy, Tyler Close, Vincent Murphy, Wenbo Zhu, Werner Baumann, Wilbur Streett, Wilfredo Sanchez Vega, William A. Rowe Jr., William Chan, Willy Tarreau, Xiaoshu Wang, Yaron Goland, Yngve Nysaeter Pettersen, Yoav Nir, Yogesh Bang, Yutaka Oiwa, Yves Lafon (long-time member of the editor team), Zed A. Shaw, and Zhong Yu.

See [Section 16 of \[RFC2616\]](#) for additional acknowledgements from prior revisions.

## **[10.](#) References**

### **[10.1.](#) Normative References**

- [Part2] Fielding, R., Ed. and J. Reschke, Ed., "Hypertext Transfer Protocol (HTTP/1.1): Semantics and Content", [draft-ietf-httpbis-p2-semantics-23](#) (work in progress), July 2013.
- [Part4] Fielding, R., Ed. and J. Reschke, Ed., "Hypertext Transfer Protocol (HTTP/1.1): Conditional Requests", [draft-ietf-httpbis-p4-conditional-23](#) (work in progress), July 2013.
- [Part5] Fielding, R., Ed., Lafon, Y., Ed., and J. Reschke, Ed., "Hypertext Transfer Protocol (HTTP/1.1): Range Requests", [draft-ietf-httpbis-p5-range-23](#) (work in progress), July 2013.
- [Part6] Fielding, R., Ed., Nottingham, M., Ed., and J. Reschke, Ed., "Hypertext Transfer Protocol (HTTP/1.1): Caching", [draft-ietf-httpbis-p6-cache-23](#) (work in progress), July 2013.
- [Part7] Fielding, R., Ed. and J. Reschke, Ed., "Hypertext Transfer Protocol (HTTP/1.1): Authentication", [draft-ietf-httpbis-p7-auth-23](#) (work in progress), July 2013.
- [RFC0793] Postel, J., "Transmission Control Protocol", STD 7, [RFC 793](#), September 1981.
- [RFC1950] Deutsch, L. and J-L. Gailly, "ZLIB Compressed Data Format Specification version 3.3", [RFC 1950](#), May 1996.



- [RFC1951] Deutsch, P., "DEFLATE Compressed Data Format Specification version 1.3", [RFC 1951](#), May 1996.
- [RFC1952] Deutsch, P., Gailly, J-L., Adler, M., Deutsch, L., and G. Randers-Pehrson, "GZIP file format specification version 4.3", [RFC 1952](#), May 1996.
- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 2119](#), March 1997.
- [RFC3986] Berners-Lee, T., Fielding, R., and L. Masinter, "Uniform Resource Identifier (URI): Generic Syntax", STD 66, [RFC 3986](#), January 2005.
- [RFC5234] Crocker, D., Ed. and P. Overell, "Augmented BNF for Syntax Specifications: ABNF", STD 68, [RFC 5234](#), January 2008.
- [USASCII] American National Standards Institute, "Coded Character Set -- 7-bit American Standard Code for Information Interchange", ANSI X3.4, 1986.
- [Welch] Welch, T., "A Technique for High Performance Data Compression", IEEE Computer 17(6), June 1984.

## **[10.2.](#) Informative References**

- [BCP115] Hansen, T., Hardie, T., and L. Masinter, "Guidelines and Registration Procedures for New URI Schemes", [BCP 115](#), [RFC 4395](#), February 2006.
- [BCP13] Freed, N., Klensin, J., and T. Hansen, "Media Type Specifications and Registration Procedures", [BCP 13](#), [RFC 6838](#), January 2013.
- [BCP90] Klyne, G., Nottingham, M., and J. Mogul, "Registration Procedures for Message Header Fields", [BCP 90](#), [RFC 3864](#), September 2004.
- [ISO-8859-1] International Organization for Standardization, "Information technology -- 8-bit single-byte coded graphic character sets -- Part 1: Latin alphabet No. 1", ISO/IEC 8859-1:1998, 1998.
- [Kri2001] Kristol, D., "HTTP Cookies: Standards, Privacy, and Politics", ACM Transactions on Internet Technology 1(2), November 2001, <<http://arxiv.org/abs/cs.SE/0105018>>.



- [RFC1919] Chatel, M., "Classical versus Transparent IP Proxies", [RFC 1919](#), March 1996.
- [RFC1945] Berners-Lee, T., Fielding, R., and H. Nielsen, "Hypertext Transfer Protocol -- HTTP/1.0", [RFC 1945](#), May 1996.
- [RFC2045] Freed, N. and N. Borenstein, "Multipurpose Internet Mail Extensions (MIME) Part One: Format of Internet Message Bodies", [RFC 2045](#), November 1996.
- [RFC2047] Moore, K., "MIME (Multipurpose Internet Mail Extensions) Part Three: Message Header Extensions for Non-ASCII Text", [RFC 2047](#), November 1996.
- [RFC2068] Fielding, R., Gettys, J., Mogul, J., Nielsen, H., and T. Berners-Lee, "Hypertext Transfer Protocol -- HTTP/1.1", [RFC 2068](#), January 1997.
- [RFC2145] Mogul, J., Fielding, R., Gettys, J., and H. Nielsen, "Use and Interpretation of HTTP Version Numbers", [RFC 2145](#), May 1997.
- [RFC2616] Fielding, R., Gettys, J., Mogul, J., Frystyk, H., Masinter, L., Leach, P., and T. Berners-Lee, "Hypertext Transfer Protocol -- HTTP/1.1", [RFC 2616](#), June 1999.
- [RFC2817] Khare, R. and S. Lawrence, "Upgrading to TLS Within HTTP/1.1", [RFC 2817](#), May 2000.
- [RFC2818] Rescorla, E., "HTTP Over TLS", [RFC 2818](#), May 2000.
- [RFC3040] Cooper, I., Melve, I., and G. Tomlinson, "Internet Web Replication and Caching Taxonomy", [RFC 3040](#), January 2001.
- [RFC4033] Arends, R., Austein, R., Larson, M., Massey, D., and S. Rose, "DNS Security Introduction and Requirements", [RFC 4033](#), March 2005.
- [RFC4559] Jaganathan, K., Zhu, L., and J. Brezak, "SPNEGO-based Kerberos and NTLM HTTP Authentication in Microsoft Windows", [RFC 4559](#), June 2006.
- [RFC5226] Narten, T. and H. Alvestrand, "Guidelines for Writing an IANA Considerations Section in RFCs", [BCP 26](#), [RFC 5226](#), May 2008.



- [RFC5246] Dierks, T. and E. Rescorla, "The Transport Layer Security (TLS) Protocol Version 1.2", [RFC 5246](#), August 2008.
- [RFC5322] Resnick, P., "Internet Message Format", [RFC 5322](#), October 2008.
- [RFC6265] Barth, A., "HTTP State Management Mechanism", [RFC 6265](#), April 2011.
- [RFC6585] Nottingham, M. and R. Fielding, "Additional HTTP Status Codes", [RFC 6585](#), April 2012.

## [Appendix A](#). HTTP Version History

HTTP has been in use by the World-Wide Web global information initiative since 1990. The first version of HTTP, later referred to as HTTP/0.9, was a simple protocol for hypertext data transfer across the Internet with only a single request method (GET) and no metadata. HTTP/1.0, as defined by [[RFC1945](#)], added a range of request methods and MIME-like messaging that could include metadata about the data transferred and modifiers on the request/response semantics. However, HTTP/1.0 did not sufficiently take into consideration the effects of hierarchical proxies, caching, the need for persistent connections, or name-based virtual hosts. The proliferation of incompletely-implemented applications calling themselves "HTTP/1.0" further necessitated a protocol version change in order for two communicating applications to determine each other's true capabilities.

HTTP/1.1 remains compatible with HTTP/1.0 by including more stringent requirements that enable reliable implementations, adding only those new features that will either be safely ignored by an HTTP/1.0 recipient or only sent when communicating with a party advertising conformance with HTTP/1.1.

It is beyond the scope of a protocol specification to mandate conformance with previous versions. HTTP/1.1 was deliberately designed, however, to make supporting previous versions easy. We would expect a general-purpose HTTP/1.1 server to understand any valid request in the format of HTTP/1.0 and respond appropriately with an HTTP/1.1 message that only uses features understood (or safely ignored) by HTTP/1.0 clients. Likewise, we would expect an HTTP/1.1 client to understand any valid HTTP/1.0 response.

Since HTTP/0.9 did not support header fields in a request, there is no mechanism for it to support name-based virtual hosts (selection of resource by inspection of the Host header field). Any server that





implements name-based virtual hosts ought to disable support for HTTP/0.9. Most requests that appear to be HTTP/0.9 are, in fact, badly constructed HTTP/1.x requests wherein a buggy client failed to properly encode linear whitespace found in a URI reference and placed in the request-target.

## **[A.1.](#) Changes from HTTP/1.0**

This section summarizes major differences between versions HTTP/1.0 and HTTP/1.1.

### **[A.1.1.](#) Multi-homed Web Servers**

The requirements that clients and servers support the Host header field ([Section 5.4](#)), report an error if it is missing from an HTTP/1.1 request, and accept absolute URIs ([Section 5.3](#)) are among the most important changes defined by HTTP/1.1.

Older HTTP/1.0 clients assumed a one-to-one relationship of IP addresses and servers; there was no other established mechanism for distinguishing the intended server of a request than the IP address to which that request was directed. The Host header field was introduced during the development of HTTP/1.1 and, though it was quickly implemented by most HTTP/1.0 browsers, additional requirements were placed on all HTTP/1.1 requests in order to ensure complete adoption. At the time of this writing, most HTTP-based services are dependent upon the Host header field for targeting requests.

### **[A.1.2.](#) Keep-Alive Connections**

In HTTP/1.0, each connection is established by the client prior to the request and closed by the server after sending the response. However, some implementations implement the explicitly negotiated ("Keep-Alive") version of persistent connections described in [Section 19.7.1 of \[RFC2068\]](#).

Some clients and servers might wish to be compatible with these previous approaches to persistent connections, by explicitly negotiating for them with a "Connection: keep-alive" request header field. However, some experimental implementations of HTTP/1.0 persistent connections are faulty; for example, if an HTTP/1.0 proxy server doesn't understand Connection, it will erroneously forward that header field to the next inbound server, which would result in a hung connection.

One attempted solution was the introduction of a Proxy-Connection header field, targeted specifically at proxies. In practice, this



was also unworkable, because proxies are often deployed in multiple layers, bringing about the same problem discussed above.

As a result, clients are encouraged not to send the Proxy-Connection header field in any requests.

Clients are also encouraged to consider the use of Connection: keep-alive in requests carefully; while they can enable persistent connections with HTTP/1.0 servers, clients using them will need to monitor the connection for "hung" requests (which indicate that the client ought stop sending the header field), and this mechanism ought not be used by clients at all when a proxy is being used.

### **[A.1.3.](#) Introduction of Transfer-Encoding**

HTTP/1.1 introduces the Transfer-Encoding header field ([Section 3.3.1](#)). Transfer codings need to be decoded prior to forwarding an HTTP message over a MIME-compliant protocol.

### **[A.2.](#) Changes from [RFC 2616](#)**

HTTP's approach to error handling has been explained. ([Section 2.5](#))

The expectation to support HTTP/0.9 requests has been removed.

The term "Effective Request URI" has been introduced. ([Section 5.5](#))

HTTP messages can be (and often are) buffered by implementations; despite it sometimes being available as a stream, HTTP is fundamentally a message-oriented protocol. ([Section 3](#))

Minimum supported sizes for various protocol elements have been suggested, to improve interoperability.

Header fields that span multiple lines ("line folding") are deprecated. ([Section 3.2.4](#))

The HTTP-version ABNF production has been clarified to be case-sensitive. Additionally, version numbers has been restricted to single digits, due to the fact that implementations are known to handle multi-digit version numbers incorrectly. ([Section 2.6](#))

The HTTPS URI scheme is now defined by this specification; previously, it was done in [Section 2.4 of \[RFC2818\]](#). ([Section 2.7.2](#))

The HTTPS URI scheme implies end-to-end security. ([Section 2.7.2](#))

Userinfo (i.e., username and password) are now disallowed in HTTP and



HTTPS URIs, because of security issues related to their transmission on the wire. ([Section 2.7.1](#))

Invalid whitespace around field-names is now required to be rejected, because accepting it represents a security vulnerability. ([Section 3.2](#))

The ABNF productions defining header fields now only list the field value. ([Section 3.2](#))

Rules about implicit linear whitespace between certain grammar productions have been removed; now whitespace is only allowed where specifically defined in the ABNF. ([Section 3.2.3](#))

The NUL octet is no longer allowed in comment and quoted-string text, and handling of backslash-escaping in them has been clarified. ([Section 3.2.6](#))

The quoted-pair rule no longer allows escaping control characters other than HTAB. ([Section 3.2.6](#))

Non-ASCII content in header fields and the reason phrase has been obsoleted and made opaque (the TEXT rule was removed). ([Section 3.2.6](#))

Bogus "Content-Length" header fields are now required to be handled as errors by recipients. ([Section 3.3.2](#))

The "identity" transfer coding token has been removed. (Sections [3.3](#) and 4)

The algorithm for determining the message body length has been clarified to indicate all of the special cases (e.g., driven by methods or status codes) that affect it, and that new protocol elements cannot define such special cases. ([Section 3.3.3](#))

"multipart/byteranges" is no longer a way of determining message body length detection. ([Section 3.3.3](#))

CONNECT is a new, special case in determining message body length. ([Section 3.3.3](#))

Chunk length does not include the count of the octets in the chunk header and trailer. ([Section 4.1](#))

Use of chunk extensions is deprecated, and line folding in them is disallowed. ([Section 4.1](#))



The segment + query components of [RFC3986](#) have been used to define the request-target, instead of abs\_path from [RFC 1808](#). ([Section 5.3](#))

The asterisk form of the request-target is only allowed in the OPTIONS method. ([Section 5.3](#))

Exactly when "close" connection options have to be sent has been clarified. ([Section 6.1](#))

"hop-by-hop" header fields are required to appear in the Connection header field; just because they're defined as hop-by-hop in this specification doesn't exempt them. ([Section 6.1](#))

The limit of two connections per server has been removed. ([Section 6.3](#))

An idempotent sequence of requests is no longer required to be retried. ([Section 6.3](#))

The requirement to retry requests under certain circumstances when the server prematurely closes the connection has been removed. ([Section 6.3](#))

Some extraneous requirements about when servers are allowed to close connections prematurely have been removed. ([Section 6.3](#))

The semantics of the Upgrade header field is now defined in responses other than 101 (this was incorporated from [\[RFC2817\]](#)). ([Section 6.7](#))

Registration of Transfer Codings now requires IETF Review ([Section 7.4](#))

The meaning of the "deflate" content coding has been clarified. ([Section 4.2.2](#))

This specification now defines the Upgrade Token Registry, previously defined in [Section 7.2 of \[RFC2817\]](#). ([Section 7.5](#))

Issues with the Keep-Alive and Proxy-Connection header fields in requests are pointed out, with use of the latter being discouraged altogether. (Appendix A.1.2)

Empty list elements in list productions (e.g., a list header field containing ", ,") have been deprecated. (Appendix B)





**Appendix B. ABNF list extension: #rule**

A #rule extension to the ABNF rules of [\[RFC5234\]](#) is used to improve readability in the definitions of some header field values.

A construct "#" is defined, similar to "\*", for defining comma-delimited lists of elements. The full form is "<n>#<m>element" indicating at least <n> and at most <m> elements, each separated by a single comma (",") and optional whitespace (OWS).

Thus,

```
1#element => element *( OWS "," OWS element )
```

and:

```
#element => [ 1#element ]
```

and for n >= 1 and m > 1:

```
<n>#<m>element => element <n-1>*<m-1>( OWS "," OWS element )
```

For compatibility with legacy list rules, recipients SHOULD accept empty list elements. In other words, consumers would follow the list productions:

```
#element => [ ( "," / element ) *( OWS "," [ OWS element ] ) ]
```

```
1#element => *( "," OWS ) element *( OWS "," [ OWS element ] )
```

Note that empty elements do not contribute to the count of elements present, though.

For example, given these ABNF productions:

```
example-list      = 1#example-list-elmt
example-list-elmt = token ; see Section 3.2.6
```

Then these are valid values for example-list (not including the double quotes, which are present for delimitation only):

```
"foo,bar"
"foo ,bar,"
"foo , ,bar,charlie "
```

But these values would be invalid, as at least one non-empty element is required:



```

""
", "
", , "

```

[Appendix C](#) shows the collected ABNF, with the list rules expanded as explained above.

### [Appendix C](#). Collected ABNF

BWS = OWS

```

Connection = *( ", " OWS ) connection-option *( OWS ", " [ OWS
  connection-option ] )
Content-Length = 1*DIGIT

```

```

HTTP-message = start-line *( header-field CRLF ) CRLF [ message-body
  ]
HTTP-name = %x48.54.54.50 ; HTTP
HTTP-version = HTTP-name "/" DIGIT "." DIGIT
Host = uri-host [ ":" port ]

```

OWS = \*( SP / HTAB )

RWS = 1\*( SP / HTAB )

```

TE = [ ( ", " / t-codings ) *( OWS ", " [ OWS t-codings ] ) ]
Trailer = *( ", " OWS ) field-name *( OWS ", " [ OWS field-name ] )
Transfer-Encoding = *( ", " OWS ) transfer-coding *( OWS ", " [ OWS
  transfer-coding ] )

```

```

URI-reference = <URI-reference, defined in \[RFC3986\], Section 4.1>
Upgrade = *( ", " OWS ) protocol *( OWS ", " [ OWS protocol ] )

```

```

Via = *( ", " OWS ) ( received-protocol RWS received-by [ RWS comment
  ] ) *( OWS ", " [ OWS ( received-protocol RWS received-by [ RWS
  comment ] ) ] )

```

```

absolute-URI = <absolute-URI, defined in \[RFC3986\], Section 4.3>
absolute-form = absolute-URI
absolute-path = 1*( "/" segment )
asterisk-form = "*"
attribute = token
authority = <authority, defined in \[RFC3986\], Section 3.2>
authority-form = authority

```

```

chunk = chunk-size [ chunk-ext ] CRLF chunk-data CRLF
chunk-data = 1*OCTET
chunk-ext = *( "; " chunk-ext-name [ "=" chunk-ext-val ] )

```



```
chunk-ext-name = token
chunk-ext-val = token / quoted-str-nf
chunk-size = 1*HEXDIG
chunked-body = *chunk last-chunk trailer-part CRLF
comment = "(" *( ctext / quoted-cpair / comment ) ")"
connection-option = token
ctext = HTAB / SP / %x21-27 ; '!'-''''
      / %x2A-5B ; '*'-'['
      / %x5D-7E ; ']'-'~'
      / obs-text

field-content = *( HTAB / SP / VCHAR / obs-text )
field-name = token
field-value = *( field-content / obs-fold )
fragment = <fragment, defined in \[RFC3986\], Section 3.5>

header-field = field-name ":" OWS field-value OWS
http-URI = "http://" authority path-abempty [ "?" query ] [ "#"
  fragment ]
https-URI = "https://" authority path-abempty [ "?" query ] [ "#"
  fragment ]

last-chunk = 1*"0" [ chunk-ext ] CRLF

message-body = *OCTET
method = token

obs-fold = CRLF ( SP / HTAB )
obs-text = %x80-FF
origin-form = absolute-path [ "?" query ]

partial-URI = relative-part [ "?" query ]
path-abempty = <path-abempty, defined in \[RFC3986\], Section 3.3>
port = <port, defined in \[RFC3986\], Section 3.2.3>
protocol = protocol-name [ "/" protocol-version ]
protocol-name = token
protocol-version = token
pseudonym = token

qdttext = HTAB / SP / "!" / %x23-5B ; '#'-'['
      / %x5D-7E ; ']'-'~'
      / obs-text
qdttext-nf = HTAB / SP / "!" / %x23-5B ; '#'-'['
      / %x5D-7E ; ']'-'~'
      / obs-text
query = <query, defined in \[RFC3986\], Section 3.4>
quoted-cpair = "\" ( HTAB / SP / VCHAR / obs-text )
quoted-pair = "\" ( HTAB / SP / VCHAR / obs-text )
```



```
quoted-str-nf = DQUOTE *( qdtext-nf / quoted-pair ) DQUOTE
quoted-string = DQUOTE *( qdtext / quoted-pair ) DQUOTE

rank = ( "0" [ "." *3DIGIT ] ) / ( "1" [ "." *3"0" ] )
reason-phrase = *( HTAB / SP / VCHAR / obs-text )
received-by = ( uri-host [ ":" port ] ) / pseudonym
received-protocol = [ protocol-name "/" ] protocol-version
relative-part = <relative-part, defined in \[RFC3986\], Section 4.2>
request-line = method SP request-target SP HTTP-version CRLF
request-target = origin-form / absolute-form / authority-form /
  asterisk-form

segment = <segment, defined in \[RFC3986\], Section 3.3>
special = "(" / ")" / "<" / ">" / "@" / "," / ";" / ":" / "\" /
  DQUOTE / "/" / "[" / "]" / "?" / "=" / "{" / "}"
start-line = request-line / status-line
status-code = 3DIGIT
status-line = HTTP-version SP status-code SP reason-phrase CRLF

t-codings = "trailers" / ( transfer-coding [ t-ranking ] )
t-ranking = OWS ";" OWS "q=" rank
tchar = "!" / "#" / "$" / "%" / "&" / "'" / "*" / "+" / "-" / "." /
  "^" / "_" / "`" / "|" / "~" / DIGIT / ALPHA
token = 1*tchar
trailer-part = *( header-field CRLF )
transfer-coding = "chunked" / "compress" / "deflate" / "gzip" /
  transfer-extension
transfer-extension = token *( OWS ";" OWS transfer-parameter )
transfer-parameter = attribute BWS "=" BWS value

uri-host = <host, defined in \[RFC3986\], Section 3.2.2>

value = word

word = token / quoted-string
```

## **[Appendix D.](#) Change Log (to be removed by RFC Editor before publication)**

### **[D.1.](#) Since [RFC 2616](#)**

Changes up to the first Working Group Last Call draft are summarized in <http://trac.tools.ietf.org/html/draft-ietf-httpbis-p1-messaging-21#appendix-D>.

### **[D.2.](#) Since [draft-ietf-httpbis-p1-messaging-21](#)**

Closed issues:





- o <<http://tools.ietf.org/wg/httpbis/trac/ticket/128>>: "Cite HTTPS URI scheme definition" (the spec now includes the HTTPS scheme definition and thus updates [RFC 2818](#))
- o <<http://tools.ietf.org/wg/httpbis/trac/ticket/389>>: "mention of 'proxies' in section about caches"
- o <<http://tools.ietf.org/wg/httpbis/trac/ticket/390>>: "use of ABNF terms from [RFC 3986](#)"
- o <<http://tools.ietf.org/wg/httpbis/trac/ticket/391>>: "transferring URIs with userinfo in payload"
- o <<http://tools.ietf.org/wg/httpbis/trac/ticket/392>>: "editorial improvements to message length definition"
- o <<http://tools.ietf.org/wg/httpbis/trac/ticket/395>>: "Connection header field MUST vs SHOULD"
- o <<http://tools.ietf.org/wg/httpbis/trac/ticket/396>>: "editorial improvements to persistent connections section"
- o <<http://tools.ietf.org/wg/httpbis/trac/ticket/397>>: "URI normalization vs empty path"
- o <<http://tools.ietf.org/wg/httpbis/trac/ticket/408>>: "p1 feedback"
- o <<http://tools.ietf.org/wg/httpbis/trac/ticket/409>>: "is parsing OBS-FOLD mandatory?"
- o <<http://tools.ietf.org/wg/httpbis/trac/ticket/410>>: "HTTPS and Shared Caching"
- o <<http://tools.ietf.org/wg/httpbis/trac/ticket/411>>: "Requirements for recipients of ws between start-line and first header field"
- o <<http://tools.ietf.org/wg/httpbis/trac/ticket/412>>: "SP and HT when being tolerant"
- o <<http://tools.ietf.org/wg/httpbis/trac/ticket/414>>: "Message Parsing Strictness"
- o <<http://tools.ietf.org/wg/httpbis/trac/ticket/415>>: "'Render'"
- o <<http://tools.ietf.org/wg/httpbis/trac/ticket/418>>: "No-Transform"
- o <<http://tools.ietf.org/wg/httpbis/trac/ticket/419>>: "p2 editorial feedback"



- o <<http://tools.ietf.org/wg/httpbis/trac/ticket/420>>: "Content-Length SHOULD be sent"
- o <<http://tools.ietf.org/wg/httpbis/trac/ticket/431>>: "origin-form does not allow path starting with "/""
- o <<http://tools.ietf.org/wg/httpbis/trac/ticket/433>>: "ambiguity in part 1 example"

### **D.3. Since [draft-ietf-httpbis-p1-messaging-22](#)**

Closed issues:

- o <<http://tools.ietf.org/wg/httpbis/trac/ticket/435>>: "Part1 should have a reference to TCP ([RFC 793](#))"
- o <<http://tools.ietf.org/wg/httpbis/trac/ticket/438>>: "media type registration template issues"
- o <<http://tools.ietf.org/wg/httpbis/trac/ticket/442>>: "BWS" (vs conformance)
- o <<http://tools.ietf.org/wg/httpbis/trac/ticket/444>>: "obs-fold language"
- o <<http://tools.ietf.org/wg/httpbis/trac/ticket/445>>: "Ordering in Upgrade"
- o <<http://tools.ietf.org/wg/httpbis/trac/ticket/446>>: "p1 editorial feedback"
- o <<http://tools.ietf.org/wg/httpbis/trac/ticket/447>>: "HTTP and TCP name delegation"
- o <<http://tools.ietf.org/wg/httpbis/trac/ticket/449>>: "Receiving a higher minor HTTP version number"
- o <<http://tools.ietf.org/wg/httpbis/trac/ticket/451>>: "HTTP(S) URIs and fragids"
- o <<http://tools.ietf.org/wg/httpbis/trac/ticket/457>>: "Registering x-gzip and x-deflate"
- o <<http://tools.ietf.org/wg/httpbis/trac/ticket/460>>: "Via and gateways"
- o <<http://tools.ietf.org/wg/httpbis/trac/ticket/465>>: "Mention 203 Non-Authoritative Information in p1"



- o <<http://tools.ietf.org/wg/httpbis/trac/ticket/476>>: "SHOULD and conformance"
- o <<http://tools.ietf.org/wg/httpbis/trac/ticket/477>>: "Pipelining language"
- o <<http://tools.ietf.org/wg/httpbis/trac/ticket/482>>: "proxy handling of a really bad Content-Length"

## Index

### A

absolute-form (of request-target) 40  
accelerator 10  
application/http Media Type 58  
asterisk-form (of request-target) 41  
authority-form (of request-target) 41

### B

browser 7

### C

cache 11  
cacheable 12  
captive portal 11  
chunked (Coding Format) 27, 30, 34  
client 7  
close 48, 53  
compress (Coding Format) 37  
connection 7  
Connection header field 48, 53  
Content-Length header field 29

### D

deflate (Coding Format) 37  
downstream 9

### E

effective request URI 43

### G

gateway 10  
Grammar  
  absolute-form 40  
  absolute-path 16  
  absolute-URI 16  
  ALPHA 6  
  asterisk-form 40



attribute 34  
authority 16  
authority-form 40  
BWS 24  
chunk 35  
chunk-data 35  
chunk-ext 35  
chunk-ext-name 35  
chunk-ext-val 35  
chunk-size 35  
chunked-body 35  
comment 26  
Connection 48  
connection-option 48  
Content-Length 29  
CR 6  
CRLF 6  
ctext 26  
CTL 6  
date2 34  
date3 34  
DIGIT 6  
DQUOTE 6  
field-content 22  
field-name 22  
field-value 22  
fragment 16  
header-field 22  
HEXDIG 6  
Host 42  
HTAB 6  
HTTP-message 19  
HTTP-name 13  
http-URI 16  
HTTP-version 13  
https-URI 18  
last-chunk 35  
LF 6  
message-body 27  
method 20  
obs-fold 22  
obs-text 26  
OCTET 6  
origin-form 40  
OWS 24  
partial-URI 16  
port 16  
protocol-name 45





protocol-version 45  
pseudonym 45  
qdttext 26  
qdttext-nf 35  
query 16  
quoted-cpair 26  
quoted-pair 26  
quoted-str-nf 35  
quoted-string 26  
rank 37  
reason-phrase 21  
received-by 45  
received-protocol 45  
request-line 20  
request-target 40  
RWS 24  
segment 16  
SP 6  
special 26  
start-line 20  
status-code 21  
status-line 21  
t-codings 37  
t-ranking 37  
tchar 26  
TE 37  
token 26  
Trailer 35  
trailer-part 35  
transfer-coding 34  
Transfer-Encoding 27  
transfer-extension 34  
transfer-parameter 34  
Upgrade 54  
uri-host 16  
URI-reference 16  
value 34  
VCHAR 6  
Via 45  
word 26  
gzip (Coding Format) 37

## H

header field 19  
header section 19  
headers 19  
Host header field 41  
http URI scheme 16



https URI scheme 17

I

inbound 9  
interception proxy 11  
intermediary 9

M

Media Type  
    application/http 58  
    message/http 57  
message 7  
message/http Media Type 57  
method 20

N

non-transforming proxy 10

O

origin server 7  
origin-form (of request-target) 40  
outbound 9

P

proxy 10

R

recipient 7  
request 7  
request-target 20  
resource 15  
response 7  
reverse proxy 10

S

sender 7  
server 7  
spider 7

T

target resource 38  
target URI 38  
TE header field 37  
Trailer header field 35  
Transfer-Encoding header field 27  
transforming proxy 10  
transparent proxy 11  
tunnel 11



## U

Upgrade header field 54  
upstream 9  
URI scheme  
  http 16  
  https 17  
user agent 7

## V

Via header field 45

## Authors' Addresses

Roy T. Fielding (editor)  
Adobe Systems Incorporated  
345 Park Ave  
San Jose, CA 95110  
USA

EMail: [fielding@gbiv.com](mailto:fielding@gbiv.com)  
URI: <http://roy.gbiv.com/>

Julian F. Reschke (editor)  
greenbytes GmbH  
Hafenweg 16  
Muenster, NW 48155  
Germany

EMail: [julian.reschke@greenbytes.de](mailto:julian.reschke@greenbytes.de)  
URI: <http://greenbytes.de/tech/webdav/>

