

HTTP  
West  
Internet-Draft  
Google

M.

Intended status: Standards Track  
2018  
Expires: June 2, 2019

November 29,

**User Agent Client Hints**  
**draft-west-ua-client-hints-00**

Abstract

This document defines a set of Client Hints that aim to provide developers with the ability to perform agent-based content negotiation when necessary, while avoiding the historical baggage and passive fingerprinting surface exposed by the venerable "User-Agent" header.

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 June 2, 2019.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2018 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.

West  
1]

Expires June 2, 2019

[Page

Table of Contents

<a href="#">1.</a>	<a href="#">Introduction</a>	
<a href="#">2</a>		
<a href="#">1.1.</a>	<a href="#">Example</a>	
<a href="#">4</a>		
<a href="#">1.2.</a>	<a href="#">Notational Conventions</a>	
<a href="#">4</a>		
<a href="#">2.</a>	<a href="#">User Agent Hints</a>	
<a href="#">4</a>		
<a href="#">2.1.</a>	<a href="#">The 'Sec-CH-Arch' Header Field</a>	
<a href="#">5</a>		
<a href="#">2.2.</a>	<a href="#">The 'Sec-CH-Model' Header Field</a>	
<a href="#">5</a>		
<a href="#">2.3.</a>	<a href="#">The 'Sec-CH-Platform' Header Field</a>	
<a href="#">6</a>		
<a href="#">2.4.</a>	<a href="#">The 'Sec-CH-UA' Header Field</a>	
<a href="#">6</a>		
<a href="#">2.5.</a>	<a href="#">Integration with Fetch</a>	
<a href="#">7</a>		
<a href="#">3.</a>	<a href="#">Security and Privacy Considerations</a>	
<a href="#">8</a>		
<a href="#">3.1.</a>	<a href="#">Secure Transport</a>	
<a href="#">8</a>		
<a href="#">3.2.</a>	<a href="#">Delegation</a>	
<a href="#">8</a>		
<a href="#">3.3.</a>	<a href="#">Access Restrictions</a>	
<a href="#">9</a>		
<a href="#">4.</a>	<a href="#">Implementation Considerations</a>	
<a href="#">9</a>		
<a href="#">4.1.</a>	<a href="#">The 'User-Agent' Header</a>	
<a href="#">9</a>		
<a href="#">4.2.</a>	<a href="#">GREASE-like UA Strings</a>	
<a href="#">9</a>		
<a href="#">4.3.</a>	<a href="#">The 'Sec-CH-' prefix</a>	
<a href="#">10</a>		
<a href="#">5.</a>	<a href="#">IANA Considerations</a>	
<a href="#">10</a>		
<a href="#">5.1.</a>	<a href="#">'Sec-CH-Arch' Header Field</a>	
<a href="#">10</a>		
<a href="#">5.2.</a>	<a href="#">'Sec-CH-Model' Header Field</a>	
<a href="#">10</a>		
<a href="#">5.3.</a>	<a href="#">'Sec-CH-Platform' Header Field</a>	
<a href="#">11</a>		
<a href="#">5.4.</a>	<a href="#">'Sec-CH-UA' Header Field</a>	
<a href="#">11</a>		
<a href="#">5.5.</a>	<a href="#">'User-Agent' Header Field</a>	
<a href="#">11</a>		
<a href="#">6.</a>	<a href="#">References</a>	
<a href="#">11</a>		
<a href="#">6.1.</a>	<a href="#">Normative References</a>	
<a href="#">11</a>		

<a href="#">6.2.</a>	Informative References . . . . .	12
<a href="#">Appendix A.</a>	Changes . . . . .	13
<a href="#">A.1.</a>	<a href="#">draft-west-ua-client-hints-00</a> . . . . .	13
	Author's Address . . . . .	13

## [1.](#) Introduction

Today, user agents generally identify themselves to servers by sending a "User-Agent" HTTP request header field along with each request (defined in [Section 5.5.3 of \[RFC7231\]](#)). Ideally, this header would give servers the ability to perform content negotiation, sending down exactly those bits that best represent the requested resource in a given user agent, optimizing both bandwidth and user experience. In practice, however, this header's value exposes far more information about the user's device than seems appropriate as a default, on the one hand, and intentionally obscures the true user agent in order to bypass misguided server-side heuristics, on the other.

For example, a recent version of Chrome on iOS identifies itself as:

```
User-Agent: Mozilla/5.0 (iPhone; CPU iPhone OS 12_0 like Mac OS X)
           AppleWebKit/605.1.15 (KHTML, like Gecko)
           CriOS/69.0.3497.105 Mobile/15E148 Safari/605.1
```

While a recent version of Edge identifies itself as:

```
User-Agent: Mozilla/5.0 (Windows NT 10.0; Win64; x64)
           AppleWebKit/537.36 (KHTML, like Gecko) Chrome/
68.0.2704.79
           Safari/537.36 Edge/18.014
```

There's quite a bit of information packed into those strings (along with a fair number of lies). Version numbers, platform details, model information, etc. are all broadcast along with every request, and form the basis for fingerprinting schemes of all sorts. Individual vendors have taken stabs at altering their user agent strings, and have run into a few categories of feedback from developers that have stymied historical approaches:

1. Brand and version information (e.g. "Chrome 69") allows websites to work around known bugs in specific releases that aren't otherwise detectable. For example, implementations of Content Security Policy have varied wildly between vendors, and it's difficult to know what policy to send in an HTTP response without knowing what browser is responsible for its parsing and execution.
2. Developers will often negotiate what content to send based on the user agent and platform. Some application frameworks, for instance, will style an application on iOS differently from the same application on Android in order to match each platform's aesthetic and design patterns.
3. Similarly to #1, OS revisions and architecture can be responsible for specific bugs which can be worked around in website's code, and narrowly useful for things like selecting appropriate executables for download (32 vs 64 bit, ARM vs Intel, etc).
4. Sophisticated developers use model/make to tailor their sites to the capabilities of the device (e.g. [\[FacebookYearClass\]](#)) and to pinpoint performance bugs and regressions which sometimes are specific to model/make.

This document proposes a mechanism which might allow user agents to be a bit more aggressive about removing entropy from the "User-Agent" string generally by giving servers that really need some specific

details about the client the ability to opt-into receiving them. It introduces four new Client Hints ([\[I-D.ietf-httpbis-client-hints\]](#)) that can provide the client's branding and version information, the

underlying operating system's branding and major version, as well as details about the underlying device. Rather than broadcasting this data to everyone, all the time, user agents can make reasonable decisions about how to respond to given sites' requests for more granular data, reducing the passive fingerprinting surface area exposed to the network.

### **1.1. Example**

A user navigates to "https://example.com/" for the first time. Their user agent sends the following header along with the HTTP request:

```
Sec-CH-UA: "Exemplary Browser 73"
```

The server is interested in rendering content consistent with the user's underlying platform, and asks for a little more information by sending an "Accept-CH" header (Section 2.2.1 of [\[I-D.ietf-httpbis-client-hints\]](#)) along with the initial response:

```
Accept-CH: UA, Platform
```

In response, the user agent includes more detailed version information, as well as information about the underlying platform in the next request:

```
Sec-CH-UA: "Exemplary Browser 73.3R8.2H.1"  
Sec-CH-Platform: "Windows 10"
```

### **1.2. 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. User Agent Hints**

The following sections define a number of HTTP request header fields that expose detail about a given user agent, which servers can opt-into receiving via the Client Hints infrastructure defined in [\[I-D.ietf-httpbis-client-hints\]](#). The definitions below assume that each user agent has defined a number of properties for itself (all of which are strings):

- o "brand" (for example: "cURL", "Edge", "The World's Best Web Browser")

West  
4]

Expires June 2, 2019

[Page



- o "major version" (for example: "72", "3", or "28")
- o "full version" (for example: "72.0.3245.12", "3.14159", or "297.70E04154A")
- o "platform brand" (for example: "Windows NT", "iOS", or "AmazingOS")
- o "platform version" (for example: "10", "12", or "17G")
- o "platform architecture" (for example: "ARM64", or "ia32")
- o "model" (for example: "", or "Pixel 2 XL")

User agents SHOULD keep these strings short and to the point, but servers MUST accept arbitrary values for each, as they are all values constructed at the user agent's whim.

### **2.1. The 'Sec-CH-Arch' Header Field**

The "Sec-CH-Platform" request header field gives a server information about the architecture of the platform on which a given user agent is executing. It is a Structured Header ([[I-D.ietf-httpbis-header-structure](#)]) whose value MUST be a string ([[I-D.ietf-httpbis-header-structure](#)], Section 3.7).

The header's ABNF is:

```
Sec-CH-Arch = sh-string
```

To generate a "Sec-CH-Arch" header value for a given request, user agents MUST:

1. If the request's client-hints set includes "Arch", then:
  1. Let "value" be a Structured Header whose value is the user agent's "platform architecture".
  2. Set a header in request's header list whose name is "Sec-CH-Arch", and whose value is "value".

### **2.2. The 'Sec-CH-Model' Header Field**

The "Sec-CH-Model" request header field gives a server information about the device on which a given user agent is executing. It is a Structured Header ([[I-D.ietf-httpbis-header-structure](#)]) whose value MUST be a string ([[I-D.ietf-httpbis-header-structure](#)], Section 3.7).

West  
5]

Expires June 2, 2019

[Page

The header's ABNF is:

```
Sec-CH-Model = sh-string
```

To generate a "Sec-CH-Model" header value for a given request, user agents MUST:

1. If the request's client-hints set includes "Model", then:
  1. Let "value" be a Structured Header whose value is the user agent's "model".
  2. Set a header in request's header list whose name is "Sec-CH-Model", and whose value is "value".

### **2.3. The 'Sec-CH-Platform' Header Field**

The "Sec-CH-Platform" request header field gives a server information about the platform on which a given user agent is executing. It is a Structured Header ([\[I-D.ietf-httpbis-header-structure\]](#)) whose value MUST be a string ([\[I-D.ietf-httpbis-header-structure\]](#), Section 3.7).

The header's ABNF is:

```
Sec-CH-Platform = sh-string
```

To generate a "Sec-CH-Platform" header value for a given request, user agents MUST:

1. If the request's client-hints set includes "Platform", then:
  1. Let "value" be a Structured Header whose value is the concatenation of the user agent's "platform brand", a U+0020 SPACE character, and the user agent's "platform version".
  2. Set a header in request's header list whose name is "Sec-CH-Platform", and whose value is "value".

### **2.4. The 'Sec-CH-UA' Header Field**

The "Sec-CH-UA" request header field gives a server information about a user agent's branding and version. It is a Structured Header ([\[I-D.ietf-httpbis-header-structure\]](#)) whose value MUST be a list ([\[I-D.ietf-httpbis-header-structure\]](#), Section 3.2). Each item in the list MUST be a string ([\[I-D.ietf-httpbis-header-structure\]](#), Section 3.7).

The header's ABNF is:

West  
6]

Expires June 2, 2019

[Page

Sec-CH-UA = sh-list

Unlike most Client Hints, the "Sec-CH-UA" header will be sent with all requests, whether or not the server opted-into receiving the header via an "Accept-CH" header. Prior to an opt-in, however, it will include only the user agent's branding information, and the major version number (both of which are fairly clearly sniffable by "examining the structure of other headers and by testing for the availability and semantics of the features introduced or modified between releases of a particular browser" [[Janc2014](#)]).

To generate a "Sec-CH-UA" header value for a given request, user agents MUST:

1. Let "value" be a Structured Header whose value is a list ([[I-D.ietf-httpbis-header-structure](#)]).
2. If the request's client-hints set includes "UA", then add an item to "value" whose value is the concatenation of the user agent's "brand", a U+0020 SPACE character, and the user agent's "full version".

Otherwise, add an item to "value" whose value is the concatenation of the user agent's "brand", a U+0020 SPACE character, and the user agent's "major version".

3. The user agent MAY execute the following steps:
  1. Append additional items to "value" containing arbitrary brand and version combinations.
  2. Randomize the order of the items in "value".

Note: See [Section 4.2](#) for more details on why these steps might be appropriate.

4. Set a header in request's header list whose name is "Sec-CH-UA", and whose value is "value".

## **2.5. Integration with Fetch**

The Fetch specification should call into the following algorithm in place of the current Step 5.11 in its HTTP-network-or-cache fetch algorithm.

To set the user agent metadata for a request ("r"), the user agent MUST execute the following steps:

West  
7]

Expires June 2, 2019

[Page

1. If request's header list does not contain "User-Agent", then the user agent MAY append "User-Agent"/default "User-Agent" value to "request"'s header list.
2. Set request's "Sec-CH-Arch" header, as described in [Section 2.1](#).
3. Set request's "Sec-CH-Model" header, as described in [Section 2.2](#).
4. Set request's "Sec-CH-Platform" header, as described in [Section 2.3](#).
5. Set request's "Sec-CH-UA" header, as described in [Section 2.4](#).

### **3. Security and Privacy Considerations**

#### **3.1. Secure Transport**

Client Hints will not be delivered to non-secure endpoints (see the secure transport requirements in Section 2.2.1 of [\[I-D.ietf-httpbis-client-hints\]](#)). This means that user agent information will not be leaked over plaintext channels, reducing the opportunity for network attackers to build a profile of a given agent's behavior over time.

#### **3.2. Delegation**

Client Hints will be delegated from top-level pages via Feature Policy (once a few patches against Fetch and Client Hints and Feature Policy land. This reduces the likelihood that user agent information will be delivered along with subresource requests, which reduces the potential for passive fingerprinting.

- o Fetch integration of Accept-CH opt-in:  
<https://github.com/whatwg/fetch/issues/773>
- o HTML integration of Accept-CH-Lifetime and the ACHL cache:  
<https://github.com/whatwg/html/issues/3774>
- o Adding new CH features to the CH list in Fetch:  
<https://github.com/whatwg/fetch/issues/725>
- o Other PRs for adding the Feature Policy 3rd party opt-in:  
<https://github.com/whatwg/fetch/issues/811> and  
<https://github.com/wicg/feature-policy/issues/220>

West  
8]

Expires June 2, 2019

[Page



### **3.3. Access Restrictions**

The information in the Client Hints defined above reveals quite a bit

of information about the user agent and the platform/device upon which it runs. User agents ought to exercise judgement before granting access to this information, and MAY impose restrictions above and beyond the secure transport and delegation requirements noted above. For instance, user agents could choose to reveal "platform architecture" only on requests it intends to download, giving the server the opportunity to serve the right binary. Likewise, they could offer users control over the values revealed to servers, or gate access on explicit user interaction via a permission prompt or via a settings interface.

## **4. Implementation Considerations**

### **4.1. The 'User-Agent' Header**

User agents SHOULD deprecate the "User-Agent" header in favor of the Client Hints model described in this document. The header, however, is likely to be impossible to remove entirely in the near-term, as existing sites' content negotiation code will continue to require its presence (see [[Rossi2015](#)] for a recent example of a new browser's struggles in this area).

One approach which might be advisable could be for each user agent to

lock the value of its "User-Agent" header, ensuring backwards compatibility by maintaining the cruddy declarations of "like Gecko" and "AppleWebKit/537.36" on into eternity. This can ratchet over time, first freezing the version number, then shifting platform and model information to something reasonably generic in order to reduce the fingerprint the header provides.

### **4.2. GREASE-like UA Strings**

History has shown us that there are real incentives for user agents to lie about their branding in order to thread the needle of sites' sniffing scripts. While I'm optimistic that we can reset expectations around sniffing by freezing the thing that's sniffed-upon today, and creating a sane set of options for developers, it's likely that this is hopelessly naive. It's reasonable to ponder what

we should do to encourage sniffing in the right way, if we believe it's going to happen one way or another.

User agents may choose to model "UA" as a set, rather than a single entry. This could encourage standardized processing of the "UA" string by Randomly including additional, intentionally incorrect,

comma-separated entries with arbitrary ordering (similar conceptually

West  
9]

Expires June 2, 2019

[Page

to [[I-D.ietf-tls-grease](#)]) could encourage standardized processing if the "UA" string by servers, and reduce the chance that we ossify on a few required strings. For example, Chrome 73's "Sec-CH-UA" header might be ""Chrome 73", "NotBrowser 12"", or ""BrowsingIsFun Version 12b", "Chrome 73"", or something completely different.

### **4.3. The 'Sec-CH-' prefix**

Based on some discussion in <https://github.com/w3ctag/design-reviews/issues/320>, it seems reasonable to forbid access to these headers from JavaScript, and demarcate them as browser-controlled client hints so they can be documented and included in requests without triggering CORS preflights. A "Sec-CH-" prefix seems like a viable approach, but this bit might shift as the broader Client Hints discussions above coalesce into something more solid that lands in specs.

## **5. IANA Considerations**

This document intends to define the "Sec-CH-Arch", "Sec-CH-Model", "Sec-CH-Platform", and "Sec-CH-UA" HTTP request header fields, and register them in the permanent message header field registry ([[RFC3864](#)]).

It also intends to deprecate the "User-Agent" header field.

### **5.1. 'Sec-CH-Arch' Header Field**

Header field name: Sec-CH-Arch

Applicable protocol: http

Status: standard

Author/Change controller: IETF

Specification document: this specification ([Section 2.1](#))

### **5.2. 'Sec-CH-Model' Header Field**

Header field name: Sec-CH-Model

Applicable protocol: http

Status: standard

Author/Change controller: IETF



Specification document: this specification ([Section 2.4](#))

### **5.3. 'Sec-CH-Platform' Header Field**

Header field name: Sec-CH-Platform

Applicable protocol: http

Status: standard

Author/Change controller: IETF

Specification document: this specification ([Section 2.3](#))

### **5.4. 'Sec-CH-UA' Header Field**

Header field name: Sec-CH-UA

Applicable protocol: http

Status: standard

Author/Change controller: IETF

Specification document: this specification ([Section 2.4](#))

### **5.5. 'User-Agent' Header Field**

Header field name: User-Agent

Applicable protocol: http

Status: deprecated

Author/Change controller: IETF

Specification document: this specification ([Section 4.1](#)), and [Section 5.5.3 of \[RFC7231\]](#)

## **6. References**

### **6.1. Normative References**

[I-D.ietf-httpbis-client-hints]  
Grigorik, I., "HTTP Client Hints", [draft-ietf-httpbis-client-hints-06](#) (work in progress), July 2018.



[I-D.ietf-httpbis-header-structure]  
Nottingham, M. and P. Kamp, "Structured Headers for  
HTTP",  
progress), [draft-ietf-httpbis-header-structure-08](#) (work in  
October 2018).

[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/info/rfc2119](https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2119)>.

[RFC3864] Klyne, G., Nottingham, M., and J. Mogul, "Registration  
Procedures for Message Header Fields", [BCP 90](#), [RFC 3864](#),  
DOI 10.17487/RFC3864, September 2004, <[https://www.rfc-  
editor.org/info/rfc3864](https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3864)>.

[RFC7231] Fielding, R., Ed. and J. Reschke, Ed., "Hypertext  
Transfer  
Protocol (HTTP/1.1): Semantics and Content", [RFC 7231](#),  
DOI 10.17487/RFC7231, June 2014, <[https://www.rfc-  
editor.org/info/rfc7231](https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7231)>.

[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/info/rfc8174>>.

## **6.2. Informative References**

[FacebookYearClass]  
Marra, C. and D. Weaver, "Year class: A classification  
system for Android", November 2014,  
<[https://code.fb.com/android/year-class-a-classification-  
system-for-android/](https://code.fb.com/android/year-class-a-classification-system-for-android/)>.

[I-D.ietf-tls-grease]  
Benjamin, D., "Applying GREASE to TLS Extensibility",  
[draft-ietf-tls-grease-01](#) (work in progress), June 2018.

[Janc2014]  
Zalewski, M. and A. Janc, "Technical analysis of client  
identification mechanisms", September 2014,  
<[https://dev.chromium.org/Home/chromium-security/client-  
identification-mechanisms#TOC-Browser-level-  
fingerprints](https://dev.chromium.org/Home/chromium-security/client-identification-mechanisms#TOC-Browser-level-fingerprints)>.

[Rossi2015]  
makes  
Rossi, J., "The Microsoft Edge Rendering Engine that  
the Web just work", May 2015,  
<[https://channel9.msdn.com/Events/WebPlatformSummit/2015/  
The-Microsoft-Edge-Rendering-Engine-that-makes-the-Web-](https://channel9.msdn.com/Events/WebPlatformSummit/2015/The-Microsoft-Edge-Rendering-Engine-that-makes-the-Web-)

[just-work#time=9m45s](#)>.

West  
12]

Expires June 2, 2019

[Page



## [Appendix A.](#) **Changes**

### [A.1.](#) [draft-west-ua-client-hints-00](#)

- o This specification sprang, fully-formed, from the head of Zeus.

#### Author's Address

Mike West  
Google

Email: [mkwst@google.com](mailto:mkwst@google.com)

