

HTTPbis
Internet-Draft
Updates: [6265](#) (if approved)
Intended status: Standards Track
Expires: May 8, 2016

M. West
Google, Inc
November 5, 2015

**Deprecate modification of 'secure' cookies from non-secure origins
draft-west-leave-secure-cookies-alone-02**

Abstract

This document updates [RFC6265](#) by removing the ability for a non-secure origin to set cookies with a 'secure' flag, and to overwrite cookies whose 'secure' flag is set. This deprecation improves the isolation between HTTP and HTTPS origins, and reduces the risk of malicious interference.

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 May 8, 2016.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2015 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.

Table of Contents

1.	Introduction	2
2.	Terminology and notation	2
3.	Recommendations	2
4.	Security Considerations	4
5.	References	4
5.1.	Normative References	4
5.2.	Informative References	4
Appendix A.	Acknowledgements	4
	Author's Address	5

[1.](#) Introduction

[Section 8.5](#) and [Section 8.6 of \[RFC6265\]](#) spell out some of the drawbacks of cookies' implementation: due to historical accident, non-secure origins can set cookies which will be delivered to secure origins in a manner indistinguishable from cookies set by that origin itself. This enables a number of attacks, which have been recently spelled out in some detail in [\[COOKIE-INTEGRITY\]](#).

We can mitigate the risk of these attacks by making it more difficult for non-secure origins to influence the state of secure origins. Accordingly, this document recommends the deprecation and removal of non-secure origins' ability to write cookies with a 'secure' flag, and their ability to overwrite cookies whose 'secure' flag is set.

[2.](#) Terminology and 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 [\[RFC2119\]](#).

The "scheme" component of a URI is defined in [Section 3 of \[RFC3986\]](#).

[3.](#) Recommendations

This document updates [Section 5.3 of \[RFC6265\]](#) as follows:

1. After step 8 of the current algorithm, which sets the cookie's "secure-only-flag", execute the following step:
 1. If the "scheme" component of the "request-uri" does not denote a "secure" protocol (as defined by the user agent),

West

Expires May 8, 2016

[Page 2]

and the cookie's "secure-only-flag" is "true", then abort these steps and ignore the newly created cookie entirely.

2. Before step 11, execute the following step:

1. If the newly created cookie's "secure-only-flag" is not set, and the "scheme" component of the "request-uri" does not denote a "secure" protocol, then abort these steps and ignore the newly created cookie entirely if the cookie store contains one or more cookies that meet all of the following criteria:

1. Their "name" matches the "name" of the newly created cookie.
2. Their "secure-only-flag" is set.
3. Their "domain" domain-matches the "domain" of the newly created cookie, or vice-versa.

Note: This comparison intentionally ignores the "path" component. The intent is to allow the "secure" flag to supercede the "path" restrictions to protect sites against cookie fixing attacks.

Note: This allows "secure" pages to override "secure" cookies with non-secure variants. Perhaps we should restrict that as well?

3. Adjust the eviction priority order at the bottom of [Section 5.3](#) to be the following:

1. Expired cookies.
2. Cookies whose "secure-only-flag" is not set.
3. Cookies that share a "domain" field with more than a predetermined number of other cookies.
4. All cookies.

Note: This means that we'd remove every non-secure cookie for every origin before removing any non-expired secure cookie. That seems like a good reason for sites to prefer the "secure" flag.

4. Security Considerations

This specification increases a site's confidence that secure cookies it sets will remain unmodified by insecure pages on hosts which it domain-matches. Ideally, sites would use HSTS as described in [RFC6797] to defend more robustly against the dangers of non-secure transport in general, but until adoption of that protection becomes ubiquitous, this deprecation this document recommends will mitigate a number of risks.

5. References

5.1. Normative References

- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 2119](#), DOI 10.17487/[RFC2119](#), March 1997, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2119>>.
- [RFC3986] Berners-Lee, T., Fielding, R., and L. Masinter, "Uniform Resource Identifier (URI): Generic Syntax", STD 66, [RFC 3986](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC3986, January 2005, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3986>>.
- [RFC6265] Barth, A., "HTTP State Management Mechanism", [RFC 6265](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC6265, April 2011, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6265>>.

5.2. Informative References

- [COOKIE-INTEGRITY] Zheng, X., Jiang, J., Liang, J., Duan, H., Chen, S., Wan, T., and N. Weaver, "Cookies Lack Integrity: Real-World Implications", n.d., <<https://www.usenix.org/system/files/conference/usenixsecurity15/sec15-paper-zheng.pdf>>.
- [RFC6797] Hodges, J., Jackson, C., and A. Barth, "HTTP Strict Transport Security (HSTS)", [RFC 6797](#), DOI 10.17487/[RFC6797](#), November 2012, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6797>>.

Appendix A. Acknowledgements

Richard Barnes encouraged a formalization of the deprecation proposal. [COOKIE-INTEGRITY] was a useful exploration of the issues [RFC6265] described.

West

Expires May 8, 2016

[Page 4]

Author's Address

Mike West
Google, Inc

Email: mkwst@google.com

URI: <https://mikewest.org/>