

Network Working Group
Internet-Draft
Intended status: Standards Track
Expires: 25 November 2022

M. Nottingham
24 May 2022

Retrofit Structured Fields for HTTP draft-ietf-httpbis-retrofit-03

Abstract

This specification nominates a selection of existing HTTP fields as having syntax that is compatible with Structured Fields, so that they can be handled as such (subject to certain caveats).

To accommodate some additional fields whose syntax is not compatible, it also defines mappings of their semantics into new Structured Fields. It does not specify how to negotiate their use.

About This Document

This note is to be removed before publishing as an RFC.

Status information for this document may be found at <https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-ietf-httpbis-retrofit/>.

Discussion of this document takes place on the HTTP Working Group mailing list (<mailto:ietf-http-wg@w3.org>), which is archived at <https://lists.w3.org/Archives/Public/ietf-http-wg/>. Working Group information can be found at <https://httpwg.org/>.

Source for this draft and an issue tracker can be found at <https://github.com/httpwg/http-extensions/labels/retrofit>.

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 <https://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 25 November 2022.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2022 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 (<https://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 Revised BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the [Trust Legal Provisions](#) and are provided without warranty as described in the Revised BSD License.

Table of Contents

1.	Introduction	2
1.1.	Notational Conventions	3
2.	Compatible Fields	3
3.	Mapped Fields	7
3.1.	URLs	8
3.2.	Dates	8
3.3.	ETags	9
3.4.	Links	9
3.5.	Cookies	10
4.	IANA Considerations	11
5.	Security Considerations	13
6.	Normative References	13
	Author's Address	14

[1.](#) Introduction

Structured Field Values for HTTP [[STRUCTURED-FIELDS](#)] introduced a data model with associated parsing and serialization algorithms for use by new HTTP field values. Fields that are defined as Structured Fields can realise a number of benefits, including:

- * Improved interoperability and security: precisely defined parsing and serialisation algorithms are typically not available for fields defined with just ABNF and/or prose.

- * Reuse of common implementations: many parsers for other fields are specific to a single field or a small family of fields.

- * Canonical form: because a deterministic serialisation algorithm is defined for each type, Structure Fields have a canonical representation.
- * Enhanced API support: a regular data model makes it easier to expose field values as a native data structure in implementations.
- * Alternative serialisations: While [\[STRUCTURED-FIELDS\]](#) defines a textual serialisation of that data model, other, more efficient serialisations of the underlying data model are also possible.

However, a field needs to be defined as a Structured Field for these benefits to be realised. Many existing fields are not, making up the bulk of header and trailer fields seen in HTTP traffic on the internet.

This specification defines how a selection of existing HTTP fields can be handled as Structured Fields, so that these benefits can be realised -- thereby making them Retrofit Structured Fields.

It does so using two techniques. [Section 2](#) lists compatible fields -- those that can be handled as if they were Structured Fields due to the similarity of their defined syntax to that in Structured Fields. [Section 3](#) lists mapped fields -- those whose syntax needs to be transformed into an underlying data model which is then mapped into that defined by Structured Fields.

Note that while implementations can parse and serialise compatible fields as Structured Fields subject to the caveats in [Section 2](#), a sender cannot generate mapped fields from [Section 3](#) and expect them to be understood and acted upon by the recipient without prior negotiation. This specification does not define such a mechanism.

[1.1](#). Notational Conventions

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT",

"SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "NOT RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in [BCP 14 \[RFC2119\]](#) [[RFC8174](#)] when, and only when, they appear in all capitals, as shown here.

2. Compatible Fields

The HTTP fields listed in Table 1 can usually have their values handled as Structured Fields according to the listed parsing and serialisation algorithms in [[STRUCTURED-FIELDS](#)], subject to the listed caveats.

The listed types are chosen for compatibility with the defined syntax of the field as well as with actual internet traffic. However, not all instances of these fields will successfully parse. This might be because the field value is clearly invalid, or it might be because it is valid but not parseable as a Structured Field.

An application using this specification will need to consider how to handle such field values. Depending on its requirements, it might be advisable to reject such values, treat them as opaque strings, or attempt to recover a structured value from them in an ad hoc fashion.

Field Name	Structured Type
Accept	List
Accept-Encoding	List
Accept-Language	List
Accept-Patch	List
Accept-Post	List
Accept-Ranges	List
Access-Control-Allow-Credentials	Item
Access-Control-Allow-Headers	List

Access-Control-Allow-Methods	List
Access-Control-Allow-Origin	Item
Access-Control-Expose-Headers	List
Access-Control-Max-Age	Item
Access-Control-Request-Headers	List
Access-Control-Request-Method	Item
Age	Item
Allow	List
ALPN	List

Alt-Svc	Dictionary
Alt-Used	Item
Cache-Control	Dictionary
CDN-Loop	List
Clear-Site-Data	List
Connection	List
Content-Encoding	List
Content-Language	List
Content-Length	List
Content-Type	Item
Cross-Origin-Resource-Policy	Item

Expect	Dictionary	
+-----+	+-----+	+-----+
Expect-CT	Dictionary	
+-----+	+-----+	+-----+
Forwarded	Dictionary	
+-----+	+-----+	+-----+
Host	Item	
+-----+	+-----+	+-----+
Keep-Alive	Dictionary	
+-----+	+-----+	+-----+
Max-Forwards	Item	
+-----+	+-----+	+-----+
Origin	Item	
+-----+	+-----+	+-----+
Pragma	Dictionary	
+-----+	+-----+	+-----+
Prefer	Dictionary	
+-----+	+-----+	+-----+
Preference-Applied	Dictionary	
+-----+	+-----+	+-----+
Retry-After	Item	
+-----+	+-----+	+-----+
Sec-WebSocket-Extensions	List	
+-----+	+-----+	+-----+
Sec-WebSocket-Protocol	List	
+-----+	+-----+	+-----+

Sec-WebSocket-Version	Item	
+-----+	+-----+	+-----+
Server-Timing	List	
+-----+	+-----+	+-----+
Surrogate-Control	Dictionary	
+-----+	+-----+	+-----+
TE	List	
+-----+	+-----+	+-----+
Timing-Allow-Origin	List	
+-----+	+-----+	+-----+
Trailer	List	
+-----+	+-----+	+-----+
Transfer-Encoding	List	
+-----+	+-----+	+-----+
Vary	List	

X-Content-Type-Options	Item
X-Frame-Options	Item
X-XSS-Protection	List

Table 1: Compatible Fields

Note the following caveats regarding compatibility:

Parameter and Dictionary keys: HTTP parameter names are case-insensitive (per Section 5.6.6 of [\[HTTP\]](#)), but Structured Fields require them to be all-lowercase. Although the vast majority of parameters seen in typical traffic are all-lowercase, compatibility can be improved by force-lowercasing parameters when parsing. Likewise, many Dictionary-based fields (e.g., Cache-Control, Expect-CT, Pragma, Prefer, Preference-Applied, Surrogate-Control) have case-insensitive keys, and compatibility can be improved by force-lowercasing them when parsing.

Parameter delimitation: The parameters rule in HTTP (see Section 5.6.6 of [\[HTTP\]](#)) allows whitespace before the ";" delimiter, but Structured Fields does not. Compatibility can be improved by allowing such whitespace when parsing.

String quoting: Section 5.6.4 of [\[HTTP\]](#) allows backslash-escaping most characters in quoted strings, whereas Structured Field Strings only escape "\" and DQUOTE. Compatibility can be improved by unescaping other characters before parsing.

Token limitations: In Structured Fields, tokens are required to

begin with an alphabetic character or "*", whereas HTTP tokens allow a wider range of characters. This prevents use of mapped values that begin with one of these characters. For example, media types, field names, methods, range-units, character and transfer codings that begin with a number or special character other than "*" might be valid HTTP protocol elements, but will not be able to be parsed as Structured Field Tokens.

Integer limitations: Structured Fields Integers can have at most 15 digits; larger values will not be able to be represented in them.

IPv6 Literals: Fields whose values contain IPv6 literal addresses (such as CDN-Loop, Host, and Origin) are not able to be represented as Structured Fields Tokens, because the brackets used to delimit them are not allowed in Tokens.

Empty Field Values: Empty and whitespace-only field values are considered errors in Structured Fields. For compatible fields, an empty field indicates that the field should be silently ignored.

Alt-Svc: Some ALPN tokens (e.g., h3-Q43) do not conform to key's syntax, and therefore cannot be represented as a Token. Since the final version of HTTP/3 uses the h3 token, this shouldn't be a long-term issue, although future tokens may again violate this assumption.

Content-Length: Note that Content-Length is defined as a List because it is not uncommon for implementations to mistakenly send multiple values. See Section 8.6 of [[HTTP](#)] for handling requirements.

Retry-After: Only the delta-seconds form of Retry-After can be represented; a Retry-After value containing a http-date will need to be converted into delta-seconds to be conveyed as a Structured Field Value.

[3.](#) Mapped Fields

Some HTTP field values have syntax that cannot be successfully parsed as Structured Fields. Instead, it is necessary to map them into a separate Structured Field with an alternative name.

For example, the Date HTTP header field carries a date:

Date: Sun, 06 Nov 1994 08:49:37 GMT

Its value is more efficiently represented as an Integer number of

delta seconds from the Unix epoch (00:00:00 UTC on 1 January 1970, minus leap seconds). Thus, the example above would be mapped to:

SF-Date: 784072177

As in [Section 2](#), these fields are unable to carry values that are not valid Structured Fields, and so an application using this specification will need to know how to support such values. Typically, handling them using the original field name is sufficient.

Each field name listed below indicates a replacement field name and a means of mapping its original value into a Structured Field.

[3.1.](#) URLs

The field names in Table 2 (paired with their mapped field names) have values that can be mapped into Structured Fields by treating the original field's value as a String.

Field Name	Mapped Field Name
Content-Location	SF-Content-Location
Location	SF-Location
Referer	SF-Referer

Table 2: URL Fields

For example, a Location field could be mapped as:

SF-Location: "https://example.com/foo"

[3.2.](#) Dates

The field names in Table 3 (paired with their mapped field names) have values that can be mapped into Structured Fields by parsing their payload according to Section 5.6.7 of [\[HTTP\]](#) and representing the result as an Integer number of seconds delta from the Unix Epoch (00:00:00 UTC on 1 January 1970, minus leap seconds).

Field Name	Mapped Field Name
Date	SF-Date
Expires	SF-Expires
If-Modified-Since	SF-IMS
If-Unmodified-Since	SF-IUS
Last-Modified	SF-LM

Table 3: Date Fields

For example, an Expires field could be mapped as:

SF-Expires: 1571965240

3.3. ETags

The field value of the ETag header field can be mapped into the SF-ETag Structured Field by representing the entity-tag as a String, and the weakness flag as a Boolean "w" parameter on it, where true indicates that the entity-tag is weak; if 0 or unset, the entity-tag is strong.

For example:

SF-ETag: "abcdef"; w=?1

If-None-Match's field value can be mapped into the SF-INM Structured Field, which is a List of the structure described above.

For example:

SF-INM: "abcdef"; w=?1, "ghijkl"

3.4. Links

The field value of the Link header field [[RFC8288](#)] can be mapped into the SF-Link List Structured Field by considering the URI-Reference as a String, and link-param as Parameters.

For example:

SF-Link: "/terms"; rel="copyright"; anchor="#foo"

[3.5.](#) Cookies

The field values of the Cookie and Set-Cookie fields [[COOKIES](#)] can be mapped into the SF-Cookie Structured Field (a List) and SF-Set-Cookie Structured Field (a Dictionary), respectively.

In each case, cookie names are Tokens. Their values are Strings, unless they can be represented accurately and unambiguously using the textual representation of another structured types (e.g., an Integer or Decimal).

Set-Cookie parameters map to Parameters on the appropriate SF-Set-Cookie member, with the parameter name being forced to lowercase. Set-Cookie parameter values are Strings unless a specific type is defined for them. This specification defines the parameter types in Table 4.

Parameter Name	Structured Type
HttpOnly	Boolean
Expires	Integer
Max-Age	Integer
Secure	Boolean
SameSite	Token

Table 4: Set-Cookie Parameter Types

Expires is mapped to an Integer representation of parsed-cookie-date (see Part x.x of [[COOKIES](#)]) expressed as a number of seconds delta from the Unix Epoch (00:00:00 UTC on 1 January 1970, minus leap seconds).

Note that although this mapping is very similar to the syntax of

Cookie and Set-Cookie headers, cookies in both fields are separated by commas, not semicolons, and multiple cookies can appear in each field.

For example:

```
SF-Set-Cookie: lang="en-US"; expires="Wed, 09 Jun 2021 10:18:14 GMT";  
              samesite=Strict; secure=?1  
SF-Cookie: SID="31d4d96e407aad42", lang="en-US"
```

Nottingham

Expires 25 November 2022

[Page 10]

Internet-Draft

Retrofit Structured Fields

May 2022

4. IANA Considerations

Please add the following note to the "Hypertext Transfer Protocol (HTTP) Field Name Registry":

The "Structured Type" column indicates the type of the field (per [RFC8941](#)), if any, and may be "Dictionary", "List" or "Item". A prefix of "*" indicates that it is a retrofit type (i.e., not natively Structured); see [this specification].

Note that field names beginning with characters other than ALPHA or "*" will not be able to be represented as a Structured Fields Token, and therefore may be incompatible with being mapped into fields that refer to it; see [this specification].

Then, add a new column, "Structured Type", with the values from [Section 2](#) assigned to the nominated registrations, prefixing each with "*" to indicate that it is a retrofit type.

Then, add the field names in Table 5, with the corresponding Structured Type as indicated, a status of "permanent" and referring to this document.

Field Name	Structured Type
SF-Content-Location	String
SF-Cookie	List
SF-Date	Item
SF-ETag	Item
SF-Expires	Item
SF-IMS	Item
SF-INM	List
SF-IUS	Item
SF-Link	List
SF-LM	Item
SF-Location	String

SF-Referer	String	
+-----+	+-----+	+-----+
SF-Set-Cookie	Dictionary	
+-----+	+-----+	+-----+

Table 5: New Fields

Finally, add the indicated Structured Type for each existing registry entry listed in Table 6.

Field Name	Structured Type
Accept-CH	List
Cache-Status	List
CDN-Cache-Control	Dictionary
Cross-Origin-Embedder-Policy	Item
Cross-Origin-Embedder-Policy-Report-Only	Item
Cross-Origin-Opener-Policy	Item
Cross-Origin-Opener-Policy-Report-Only	Item
Origin-Agent-Cluster	Item

Priority	Dictionary
Proxy-Status	List

Table 6: Existing Fields

5. Security Considerations

[Section 2](#) identifies existing HTTP fields that can be parsed and serialised with the algorithms defined in [[STRUCTURED-FIELDS](#)]. Variances from existing parser behavior might be exploitable, particularly if they allow an attacker to target one implementation in a chain (e.g., an intermediary). However, given the considerable variance in parsers already deployed, convergence towards a single parsing algorithm is likely to have a net security benefit in the longer term.

[Section 3](#) defines alternative representations of existing fields. Because downstream consumers might interpret the message differently based upon whether they recognise the alternative representation, implementations are prohibited from generating such fields unless they have negotiated support for them with their peer. This specification does not define such a mechanism, but any such definition needs to consider the implications of doing so carefully.

6. Normative References

Nottingham Expires 25 November 2022 [Page 13]

Internet-Draft Retrofit Structured Fields May 2022

[COOKIES] Chen, L., Englehardt, S., West, M., and J. Wilander, "Cookies: HTTP State Management Mechanism", Work in Progress, Internet-Draft, [draft-ietf-httpbis-rfc6265bis-10](#), 24 April 2022, <<https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/html/draft-ietf-httpbis-rfc6265bis-10>>.

[HTTP] Fielding, R. T., Nottingham, M., and J. Reschke, "HTTP Semantics", Work in Progress, Internet-Draft, [draft-ietf-httpbis-semantics-19](#), 12 September 2021, <<https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/html/draft-ietf-httpbis-semantics-19>>.

[RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 2119](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC2119, March 1997, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc2119>>.

[RFC8174] Leiba, B., "Ambiguity of Uppercase vs Lowercase in [RFC 2119](#) Key Words", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 8174](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8174, May 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc8174>>.

[RFC8288] Nottingham, M., "Web Linking", [RFC 8288](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8288, October 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc8288>>.

[STRUCTURED-FIELDS]

Nottingham, M. and P-H. Kamp, "Structured Field Values for HTTP", [RFC 8941](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8941, February 2021, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc8941>>.

Author's Address

Mark Nottingham
Prahran
Australia
Email: mnot@mnot.net
URI: <https://www.mnot.net/>