Abstract

The Evidence Record Syntax (ERS) and the conventions for including these evidence record in the Server-Based Certificate Validation Protocol (SCVP) are expressed using ASN.1. This document updates those ASN.1 modules to conform to the 2002 version of ASN.1 and employ the conventions adopted in RFC 5911, RFC 5912, and RFC 6268. There are no bits-on-the-wire changes to any of the formats; this is simply a change to the ASN.1 syntax.

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 19 August 2021.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2021 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.
1. Introduction

Some developers would like the IETF to use the latest version of ASN.1 in its standards. This document provides alternate ASN.1 modules to assist in that goal.

The Evidence Record Syntax (ERS) [RFC4998] provides two ASN.1 modules, one using the 1988 syntax [OLD-ASN1], which has been deprecated by the ITU-T, and another one using the 2002 syntax [NEW-ASN1], which continued to be maintained and enhanced. This document provides an alternate ASN.1 module that follows the conventions established in [RFC5911], [RFC5912], and [RFC6268].

In addition, [RFC5276] specifies the mechanism for conveying Evidence Records in the Server-Based Certificate Validation Protocol (SCVP) [RFC5055]. There is only one ASN.1 module in [RFC5276], and it uses the 1988 syntax [OLD-ASN1]. This document provides an alternate ASN.1 module using the 2002 syntax [NEW-ASN1] and follows the conventions established in [RFC5911], [RFC5912], and [RFC6268]. Note that [RFC5912] already includes an alternate ASN.1 module for SCVP [RFC5055].
The alternate ASN.1 modules in this document get some of their definitions from places different than the modules in [RFC4998] and [RFC5276]. The idea is that these alternate ASN.1 modules, when combined with the modules in [RFC5911], [RFC5912], and [RFC6268] can stand on their own. These modules do not import definitions from anywhere else, some of which are somewhat difficult to find.

2. ASN.1 Module for RFC 4998

<CODE BEGINS>
ERS-2021
{ iso(1) identified-organization(3) dod(6) internet(1)
  security(5) mechanisms(5) ltans(11) id-mod(0)
  id-mod-ers(1) id-mod-ers-v2(2) }

DEFINITIONS IMPLICIT TAGS ::= BEGIN
EXPORTS ALL;
IMPORTS

ContentInfo
  FROM CryptographicMessageSyntax-2010 -- in [RFC6268]
  { iso(1) member-body(2) us(840) rsadsi(113549) pkcs(1)
    pkcs-9(9) smime(16) modules(0) id-mod-cms-2009(58) }

AlgorithmIdentifier{}, DIGEST-ALGORITHM
  FROM AlgorithmInformation-2009 -- in [RFC5912]
  { iso(1) identified-organization(3) dod(6) internet(1)
    security(5) mechanisms(5) pkix(7) id-mod(0)
    id-mod-algorithmInformation-02(58) }

AttributeSet{}, ATTRIBUTE
  FROM PKIX-CommonTypes-2009 -- in [RFC5912]
  { iso(1) identified-organization(3) dod(6) internet(1)
    security(5) mechanisms(5) pkix(7) id-mod(0)
    id-mod-pkixCommon-02(57) }

ltans OBJECT IDENTIFIER ::= { iso(1) identified-organization(3)
  dod(6) internet(1) security(5) mechanisms(5) ltans(11) }

EvidenceRecord ::= SEQUENCE {
  version INTEGER { v1(1) },
  digestAlgorithms SEQUENCE OF AlgorithmIdentifier
    (DIGEST-ALGORITHM, {...}),
  cryptoInfos [0] CryptoInfos OPTIONAL,
}
</CODE BEGINS>
encryptionInfo  [1] EncryptionInfo OPTIONAL,
archiveTimeStampSequence  ArchiveTimeStampSequence }

CryptoInfos ::= SEQUENCE SIZE (1..MAX) OF Attribute

ArchiveTimeStamp ::= SEQUENCE {
digestAlgorithm [0] AlgorithmIdentifier
    {DIGEST-ALGORITHM, [...]} OPTIONAL,
attributes   [1] Attributes OPTIONAL,
reducedHashtree [2] SEQUENCE OF PartialHashtree OPTIONAL,
timeStamp    ContentInfo }

PartialHashtree ::= SEQUENCE OF OCTET STRING

Attributes ::= SET SIZE (1..MAX) OF Attribute

ArchiveTimeStampChain ::= SEQUENCE OF ArchiveTimeStamp

ArchiveTimeStampSequence ::= SEQUENCE OF ArchiveTimeStampChain

EncryptionInfo ::= SEQUENCE {
    encryptionInfoType  ENCINFO-TYPE.&id
        {{SupportedEncryptionAlgorithms}},
    encryptionInfoValue  ENCINFO-TYPE.&Type
        {{SupportedEncryptionAlgorithms}{@encryptionInfoType}) }

ENCINFO-TYPE ::= TYPE-IDENTIFIER

SupportedEncryptionAlgorithms ENCINFO-TYPE ::= { ... }

aa-er-internal ATTRIBUTE ::= 
    { TYPE EvidenceRecord IDENTIFIED BY id-aa-er-internal }

id-aa-er-internal OBJECT IDENTIFIER ::= { iso(1) member-body(2)
    us(840) rsadsi(113549) pkcs(1) pkcs9(9) smime(16) id-aa(2) 49 }

aa-er-external ATTRIBUTE ::= 
    { TYPE EvidenceRecord IDENTIFIED BY id-aa-er-external }

id-aa-er-external OBJECT IDENTIFIER ::= { iso(1) member-body(2)
    us(840) rsadsi(113549) pkcs(1) pkcs9(9) smime(16) id-aa(2) 50 }

ERSAttrSet ATTRIBUTE ::= { aa-er-internal | aa-er-external, ... }

Attribute ::= AttributeSet{{ERSAttrSet}}

END

<CODE ENDS>
3. ASN.1 Module for RFC 5276

<CODE BEGINS>
LTANS-SCVP-EXTENSION-2021
   { iso(1) identified-organization(3) dod(6) internet(1)
      security(5) mechanisms(5) ltans(11) id-mod(0)
      id-mod-ers-scvp(5) id-mod-ers-scvp-v2(2) }

DEFINITIONS IMPLICIT TAGS ::= BEGIN

EXPORTS ALL;

IMPORTS

id-swb, CertBundle, WANT-BACK, AllWantBacks
FROM SCVP-2009 -- in [RFC5912]
   { iso(1) identified-organization(3) dod(6) internet(1)
     security(5) mechanisms(5) pkix(7) id-mod(0)
     id-mod-scvp-02(52) }

EvidenceRecord
FROM ERS-2021 -- in [ThisRFC]
   { iso(1) identified-organization(3) dod(6) internet(1)
     security(5) mechanisms(5) ltans(11) id-mod(0)
     id-mod-ers(1) id-mod-ers-v2(2) }
;

EvidenceRecordWantBack ::= SEQUENCE {
   targetWantBack  WANT-BACK.&id ({ExpandedWantBacks}),
   evidenceRecord EvidenceRecord OPTIONAL }

EvidenceRecordWantBacks ::= SEQUENCE SIZE (1..MAX) OF EvidenceRecordWantBack

EvidenceRecords ::= SEQUENCE SIZE (1..MAX) OF EvidenceRecord

ExpandedWantBacks WANT-BACK ::= { AllWantBacks
   NewWantBacks
   ERSWantBacks, ... }

NewWantBacks WANT-BACK ::= { swb-partial-cert-path, ... }

swb-partial-cert-path WANT-BACK ::= {
   CertBundle IDENTIFIED BY id-swb-partial-cert-path }

id-swb-partial-cert-path OBJECT IDENTIFIER ::= {id-swb 15 }
</CODE ENDS>
ERSWantBacks WANT-BACK ::= { swb-ers-pkc-cert |
                      swb-ers-best-cert-path |
                      swb-ers-partial-cert-path |
                      swb-ers-revocation-info |
                      swb-ers-all, ... }

swb-ers-pkc-cert WANT-BACK ::= |
                      { EvidenceRecord IDENTIFIED BY id-swb-ers-pkc-cert }

id-swb-ers-pkc-cert OBJECT IDENTIFIER ::= {id-swb 16 }

swb-ers-best-cert-path WANT-BACK ::= |
                      { EvidenceRecord IDENTIFIED BY id-swb-ers-best-cert-path }

id-swb-ers-best-cert-path OBJECT IDENTIFIER ::= {id-swb 17 }

swb-ers-partial-cert-path WANT-BACK ::= |
                      { EvidenceRecord IDENTIFIED BY id-swb-ers-partial-cert-path }

id-swb-ers-partial-cert-path OBJECT IDENTIFIER ::= {id-swb 18 }

swb-ers-revocation-info WANT-BACK ::= |
                      { EvidenceRecords IDENTIFIED BY id-swb-ers-revocation-info }

id-swb-ers-revocation-info OBJECT IDENTIFIER ::= {id-swb 19 }

swb-ers-all WANT-BACK ::= |
                      { EvidenceRecordWantBacks IDENTIFIED BY id-swb-ers-all }

id-swb-ers-all OBJECT IDENTIFIER ::= {id-swb 20 }

END

<CODE ENDS>

4. IANA Considerations

IANA is requested to assign two object identifiers from the "SMI Security for LTANS Module Identifier" registry to identify the two ASN.1 modules in this document.

The assignment of these object identifiers is requested:

1.3.6.1.5.5.11.0.1.2 id-mod-ers-v2 [ThisRFC]
1.3.6.1.5.5.11.0.5.2 id-mod-ers-scvp-v2 [ThisRFC]
5. Security Considerations

Please see the security considerations in [RFC4998] and [RFC5276]. This document makes no changes to the security considerations in those documents. The ASN.1 modules in this document preserve bits-on-the-wire as the ASN.1 modules that they replace.

6. References

6.1. Normative References


6.2. Informative References

Authors’ Addresses

Russ Housley
Vigil Security, LLC
516 Dranesville Road
Herndon, VA, 20170
United States of America

Email: housley@vigilsec.com

Carl Wallace
Red Hound Software, Inc.
5112 27th St. N.
Arlington, VA, 22207
United States of America

Email: carl@redhoundsoftware.com
Abstract

In the decade since [RFC6125] was published, the subjectAlternativeName extension (SAN), as defined in [RFC5280] has become ubiquitous. This document updates [RFC6125] to specify that the fall-back techniques of using the commonName attribute to identify the service must not be used. This document also places some limitations on the use of wildcards in SAN fields.

The original context of [RFC6125], using X.509 certificates for server identity with Transport Layer Security (TLS), is not changed.

Discussion Venues

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

This draft is discussed in the UTA working group, https://datatracker.ietf.org/wg/uta/.

Source for this draft and an issue tracker can be found at https://github.com/richsalz/draft-rsalz-use-san.

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 14 September 2021.
1. Introduction

In the decade since [RFC6125] was published, the subjectAlternativeName extension (SAN), as defined in [RFC5280] has become ubiquitous. This document updates [RFC6125] to specify that the fall-back techniques of using the commonName attribute to identify the service must not be used. This document also places some limitations on the use of wildcards in SAN fields.

The original context of [RFC6125], using X.509 certificates for server identity with Transport Layer Security (TLS), is not changed. In addition to the examples in that document, the Baseline Requirements of the CA/Browser Forum, [CABBR], might also be useful.
2. Conventions and Definitions

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.

The terminology from [RFC6125] is used here. Specifically, the following terms and brief definition (as a reminder):

* CN-ID: the Common Name element of a Distinguished Name.
* DNS-ID: a domain name entry in a SAN extension.

3. The New Rules

The CN-ID MUST NOT be used. The appropriate value in the SAN extension MUST be used to get the presented identity of the server.

While not discussed in [RFC6125] this section also implicitly prohibits the use of the Domain Component or emailAddress RDN’s.

The following sections repeat the above rule in other forms, for the purpose of updating [RFC6125].

3.1. Designing Application Protocols

Applications should determine which form of name they want to use, and specify the appropriate SAN extension. Unless there are reasons to do otherwise, applications SHOULD use the DNS-ID form.

3.2. Representing Server Identity

Servers MUST NOT request certificates that contain CN-ID in the subject. If the Common Name RDN must be present in the certificate, it MUST be in a form that cannot be mistaken for a CN-ID.

3.3. Verifying Service Identity

When constructing a list of reference identifiers, the client MUST NOT include any CN-ID present in the certificate. This means that section 6.4.4 of [RFC6125] MUST be ignored.
4. Constraints on Wildcards

Wildcard certificates are discussed in section 7.2 of [RFC6125], which says that the specifications "are not clear or consistent" about where a wildcard can appear.

This documents specifies that a wildcard can appear

* only as the left-most label; or

* as the last character in a left-most label

5. Security Considerations

The CN-ID, domainComponent, and emailAddress RDN fields are unstructured free text, and using them is dependant on ordering and encoding concerns. In addition, their evaluation when PKIX nameConstraints are present is ambiguous. This document removes those fields from use, so a source of possible errors is removed.

Because of the ambiguity around wildcards, [RFC6125] mentions that it is possible to have exploitable differences in behavior. By simplifying those practices to one rule, this source of errors should be avoided.

All other security considerations of [RFC6125] and its dependant documents are still relevant.

6. IANA Considerations

This document has no IANA actions.
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1. Introduction and Design Principles

Organizations that manage sensitive data often employ application-level encryption to protect data at rest. When this solution is used, it is common that very large numbers of encrypted data items are stored, potentially for a long time. Security best practices, complicated organizational structures, as well as the existence of modern key management systems, lead to the proliferation of large numbers of encryption keys. After a while it becomes difficult to identify the encryption key that was used for a particular piece of
data, with the situation becoming even more complicated when multiple
key management systems are used by the same organization.

Application-level encryption can be deployed at different scales: in
some cases a multi-megabyte file may be encrypted with a single key.
In other cases, we may want to deploy encryption for specific
database fields, which can easily manifest itself as millions of keys
for a single database table.

Tagging encrypted data with metadata supports a number of important
use cases: it allows the organization to better catalog the data
(a.k.a. "data governance"), to discover the owner of each piece of
encrypted data, to detect data encrypted with outdated keys.

1.1. Terminology

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. Motivation

Our main goal in defining a common ciphertext format is to allow
organizations to manage large scale data, encrypted at rest using
multiple key management and encryption services. Additional
motivations for an enterprise to use a common format are:

- Cross-KMS-provider interoperability, to simplify automated
management of data sourced from multiple origins.

- Proprietary data encryption formats mean that the data remains
tied to a single vendor.

- Standardization around key management best practices.

2.1. Design Goals

Some of the goals behind this design include:

- The format should allow simple and efficient detection of
encrypted data, in support of automated data governance and key
lifecycle management.

- The format should be space-efficient, since it may be used for
very large numbers of small encrypted items. As a result,
important information is associated with the (stored) key, rather than the ciphertext.

- Specifically, following security best practices, a given key material should be used with only a single cryptographic algorithm. Therefore, the algorithm identifier should be stored with the key (or the key version), rather than with the ciphertext.

- The format defined here only covers the ciphertext header, and not the ciphertext itself (referred to as "body" in this document). The body is defined elsewhere, such as [NISTSP800-38D] for AES-GCM.

- The header is not encrypted. Integrity-protection is optional. See Section 6.1 for details.

- The format should support key versioning, i.e. automated, periodic rotation of keys.

- The format should support granular key management by allowing for key derivation and key wrapping.

- The format should allow for generic tools to perform partial attribution of ciphertext, i.e. to associate it with a specific key provider. More specific, possibly provider-specific tools are required for full attribution.

2.2. Previous Work

A few notable formats are:

- The Amazon Web Services SDK message format, documented here [1]. This format is specific to the AWS library, and aimed at users of the AWS Key Management System (KMS).

- The wire format [2] defined by Google’s Tink library.

- The format defined by the KMIP 2.1 [3] specification, which is targeted at data transmittal, rather than storage.

3. The Ciphertext Format

3.1. Format Overview

The ciphertext is prefixed by a header, which in turn, consists of a short fixed header and variable header. The variable header is a CBOR [RFC8949] map.
Following the header is the body of the ciphertext. The format (including length) of the body is out of scope for this document.

3.1.1. Fixed Header

The fixed header consists of:

- A single constant octet 0x08 (see Section 3.3).
- A single octet denoting the format version. The version is 0x01 for the format defined in this document.

3.1.2. Variable Header

The variable header is a CBOR map consisting of elements from the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field Name</th>
<th>Map Key</th>
<th>Value Type</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Mandatory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key Provider</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unsigned</td>
<td>The organization responsible for the key management system.</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key ID</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Byte</td>
<td>An encryption key identifier, where the key is stored in a key management system. This must denote a unique key, even if the Provider supports multiple tenants. Encoding of this field is Provider-specific. The field must appear once.</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Version</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Unsigned</td>
<td>A version of a key, where the key is rotated on a periodic basis. Encoding of this field is Provider-specific. The field must appear at most</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field</td>
<td>Length</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary Data</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Byte string</td>
<td>Additional data required to derive a specific key from the referenced key (and key version, if any), see also Section 3.1.3. The field must appear at most once.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonce</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Byte string</td>
<td>A nonce or initialization vector (IV), if required by the cipher algorithm. We note that an implementation may prefer to store the nonce and authentication tag in-line with the ciphertext.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authentication Tag</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Byte string</td>
<td>An authentication tag or integrity check value (ICV), if required by the cipher algorithm.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Authenticated Data</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Byte string</td>
<td>Additional authenticated data (AAD), which is integrity-protected but not encrypted by the cipher.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.1.3. Deriving a Specific Key

The Auxiliary Data field is used to support derivation of a key, specific to the ciphertext being managed. There are two common ways to obtain this specific key:

- Using a key derivation function: \( SK = KDF(key, aux-data) \)
- Decryption of a wrapped key: \( SK = Decrypt(key, aux-data) \)
The exact algorithm is implementation dependent, and should be uniquely defined by the combination of Key Provider, Key ID and (if given) Key Version.

3.2. Receiving Ciphertext

Correct interpretation of the format may have security implications, making it important to define the exact semantics even when the entity that receives a ciphertext may not understand parts of the header.

- A recipient MUST reject a malformed header, e.g. if the total length is larger than the physical length allocated to it based on higher-level network protocols or storage formats.

- A recipient MUST reject a ciphertext if it does not recognize the format version.

- A recipient MUST reject a ciphertext if the variable header is not valid CBOR, as per [RFC8949] Sec. 5.3.1. In particular, it MUST reject duplicate map keys.

- A recipient MUST accept a ciphertext even if it does not recognize some of the map keys. It MUST ignore the unknown map keys and MUST interpret all known ones. In other words, the only way to introduce new mandatory map keys is by incrementing the format version.

- If ciphertext integrity protection coverage includes the header, a recipient MUST reject the header as well as the ciphertext if the integrity protection fails to validate.

3.3. Fixed Header Rationale

We chose the initial byte 0x08, since strings are very unlikely to start with it, as we explain below. Automated tools can detect encrypted data in structured contexts (e.g., a SQL database column) by sampling a number of data items and if all start with this byte, determining that they are encrypted with a high probability.

The byte 0x08 encodes the ASCII control character "backspace". It has the same meaning in UTF-8, and the 08 block of UTF-16 characters is only populated by two very small languages and rarely-used extended Arabic characters [4].
4. Example

4.1. Fixed Header

"08 01"

4.2. Variable Header: CBOR Diagnostic Notation

" {1: 65535, 2: h’1122334455’, 3: 6, } "

4.3. Variable Header: Binary

" a3 01 19 ff ff 02 45 11 22 33 44 55 03 06 "

4.4. Complete Header

" 08 01 a3 01 19 ff ff 02 45 11 22 33 44 55 03 06 "

4.5. CDDL

The following non-normative snippet defines the format of the variable header using CDDL [RFC8610].

```cddl
var_header = {
    K_KEY_PROVIDER: uint,
    K_KEY_ID: bstr,
    ? K_KEY_VERSION: uint,
    ? K_AUX_DATA: bstr,
    ? K_NONCE : bstr,
    ? K_AUTH_TAG : bstr,
    ? K_AAD : bstr,
    *uint => any ; extensions
}
```

K_RESERVED = 0
K_KEY_PROVIDER = 1
K_KEY_ID = 2
K_KEY_VERSION = 3
K_AUX_DATA = 4
K_NONCE = 5
K_AUTH_TAG = 6
K_AAD = 7

; extend here
5. IANA Considerations

TBD: establish a registry for Types, with 128-255 as private use.

TBD: establish a registry of Key Providers.

6. Security Considerations

6.1. Integrity Protection

The format defined here does not include integrity protection for the header, and neither does it mandate that the encrypted item’s integrity protection should include the header.

Data encrypted at rest is typically vulnerable to denial of service attacks, since (assuming the data is integrity protected) an attacker that can change the ciphertext can trivially cause it to fail validation.

There are cases where it is convenient to manipulate the ciphertext header, even if the data itself remains encrypted and unmodified. For example, when migrating between formats or when bulk-changing metadata associated with the ciphertext. On the other hand, it is a best practice to protect cryptographic metadata against malicious modification. We are currently not aware of a specific threat vector associated with malicious changes to the proposed format, at least assuming the use of AEAD ciphers.
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1. Introduction

This document defines a simple format for representing an HTTP message ([HTTP]), either request or response. This allows for the encoding of HTTP messages that can be conveyed outside of an HTTP protocol. This enables the transformation of entire messages, including the application of authenticated encryption.

This format is informed by the framing structure of HTTP/2 ([H2]) and HTTP/3 ([H3]). In comparison, this format simpler by virtue of not including either header compression ([HPACK], [QPACK]) or a generic framing layer.
This format provides an alternative to the "message/http" content type defined in [MESSAGING]. A binary format permits more efficient encoding and processing of messages. A binary format also reduces exposure to security problems related to processing of HTTP messages.

Two modes for encoding are described:
* a known-length encoding includes length prefixes for all major message components; and
* an indefinite-length encoding enables efficient generation of messages where lengths are not known when encoding starts.

2. Conventions and Definitions

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.

This document uses terminology from HTTP ([HTTP]) and notation from QUIC ([QUIC]).

3. Format

An HTTP message is split into five sections, following the structure defined in Section 6 of [HTTP]:

1. Framing indicator. This format uses a single integer to describe framing, which describes whether the message is a request or response and how subsequent sections are formatted; see Section 3.3.

2. For a response, any number of interim responses, each consisting of an informational status code and header section.

3. Control data. For a request, this contains the request method and target. For a response, this contains the status code.

4. Header section. This contains zero or more header fields.

5. Content. This is a sequence of zero or more bytes.

6. Trailer section. This contains zero or more trailer fields.

All lengths and numeric values are encoded using the variable-length integer encoding from [QUIC].
3.1. Known Length Messages

A message that has a known length at the time of construction uses the format shown in Figure 1.

Message with Known-Length {
  Framing (i) = 0..1,
  Known-Length Informational Response (..) ..,
  Control Data (..),
  Known-Length Field Section (..),
  Known-Length Content (..),
  Known-Length Field Section (..),
}

Known-Length Field Section {
  Length (i) = 2..,
  Field Line (..) ..,
}

Known-Length Content {
  Content Length (i),
  Content (..)
}

Known-Length Informational Response {
  Informational Response Control Data (..),
  Known-Length Field Section (..),
}

Figure 1: Known-Length Message

That is, a known-length message consists of a framing indicator, a block of control data that is formatted according to the value of the framing indicator, a header section with a length prefix, binary content with a length prefix, and a trailer section with a length prefix.

Response messages that contain informational status codes result in a different structure; see Section 3.5.1.

Fields in the header and trailer sections consist of a length-prefixed name and length-prefixed value. Both name and value are sequences of bytes that cannot be zero length.

The format allows for the message to be truncated before any of the length prefixes that precede the field sections or content. This reduces the overall message size. A message that is truncated at any other point is invalid; see Section 4.
The variable-length integer encoding means that there is a limit of 2^62-1 bytes for each field section and the message content.

3.2. Indeterminate Length Messages

A message that is constructed without encoding a known length for each section uses the format shown in Figure 2:

```plaintext
Indeterminate-Length Message {
  Framing Indicator (i) = 2..3,
  Indeterminate-Length Informational Response (..) ...,
  Control Data (..),
  Indeterminate-Length Field Section (..),
  Indeterminate-Length Content (..) ...,
  Indeterminate-Length Field Section (..),
}

Indeterminate-Length Content {
  Indeterminate-Length Content Chunk (..) ..., 
  Content Terminator (i) = 0,
}

Indeterminate-Length Content Chunk {
  Chunk Length (i) = 1..,
  Chunk (..)
}

Indeterminate-Length Field Section {
  Field Line (..) ...,
  Content Terminator (i) = 0,
}

Indeterminate-Length Informational Response {
  Informational Response Control Data (..),
  Indeterminate-Length Field Section (..),
}
```

Figure 2: Indeterminate-Length Message

That is, an indeterminate length consists of a framing indicator, a block of control data that is formatted according to the value of the framing indicator, a header section that is terminated by a zero value, any number of non-zero-length chunks of binary content, a zero value, and a trailer section that is terminated by a zero value.

Response messages that contain informational status codes result in a different structure; see Section 3.5.1.
Indeterminate-length messages can be truncated in a similar way as known-length messages. Truncation occurs after the control data, or after the Content Terminator field that ends a field section or sequence of content chunks. A message that is truncated at any other point is invalid; see Section 4.

Indeterminate-length messages use the same encoding for field lines as known-length messages; see Section 3.6.

3.3. Framing Indicator

The start of each is a framing indicator that is a single integer that describes the structure of the subsequent sections. The framing indicator can take just four values:

* A value of 0 describes a request of known length.
* A value of 1 describes a response of known length.
* A value of 2 describes a request of indeterminate length.
* A value of 3 describes a response of indeterminate length.

Other values cause the message to be invalid; see Section 4.

3.4. Request Control Data

The control data for a request message includes four values that correspond to the values of the ":method", ":scheme", ":authority", and ":path" pseudo-header fields described in HTTP/2 (Section 8.1.2.3 of [H2]). These fields are encoded, each with a length prefix, in the order listed.

The rules in Section 8.1.2.3 of [H2] for constructing pseudo-header fields apply to the construction of these values. However, where the ":authority" pseudo-header field might be omitted in HTTP/2, a zero-length value is encoded instead.

The format of request control data is shown in Figure 3.
Request Control Data {
    Method Length (i),
    Method (..),
    Scheme Length (i),
    Scheme (..),
    Authority Length (i),
    Authority (..),
    Path Length (i),
    Path (..),
}

Figure 3: Format of Request Control Data

3.5. Response Control Data

The control data for a request message includes a single field that corresponds to the ":status" pseudo-header field in HTTP/2 [H2]. This field is encoded as a single variable length integer, not a decimal string.

The format of final response control data is shown in Figure 4.

Final Response Control Data {
    Status Code (i) = 200..599,
}

Figure 4: Format of Final Response Control Data

3.5.1. Informational Status Codes

This format supports informational status codes (see Section 15.2 of [HTTP]). Responses that include information status codes are encoded by repeating the response control data and associated header section until the final status code is encoded.

The format of the informational response control data is shown in Figure 5.

Informational Response Control Data {
    Status Code (i) = 100..199,
}

Figure 5: Format of Informational Response Control Data
A response message can include any number of informational responses. If the response control data includes an informational status code (that is, a value between 100 and 199 inclusive), the control data is followed by a header section (encoded with known- or indeterminate-length according to the framing indicator). After the header section, another response control data block follows.

3.6. Header and Trailer Field Lines

Header and trailer sections consist of zero or more field lines; see Section 5 of [HTTP]. The format of a field section depends on whether the message is known- or intermediate-length.

Each field line includes a name and a value. Both the name and value are non-zero length sequences of bytes. The format of a field line is shown in Figure 6.

Field Line {
    Name Length (i) = 1..,
    Name (..),
    Value Length (i) = 1..,
    Value (..),
}

Figure 6: Format of a Field Line

For field names, byte values that are not permitted in an HTTP field name cause the message to be invalid; see Section 5.1 of [HTTP] for a definition of what is valid and Section 4 for handling of invalid messages.

In addition, values from the ASCII uppercase range (0x41-0x5a inclusive) MUST be translated to lowercase values (0x61-0x7a) when generating or forwarding messages. A recipient MUST treat a message containing field names with bytes in the range 0x41-0x5a as invalid; see Section 4.

For field values, byte values that are not permitted in an HTTP field value cause the message to be invalid; see Section 5.5 of [HTTP] for a definition of valid values.

The same field name can be repeated in multiple field lines; see Section 5.2 of [HTTP] for the semantics of repeated field names and rules for combining values.
Like HTTP/2, this format has an exception for the combination of multiple instances of the "Cookie" field. Instances of fields with the ASCII-encoded value of "cookie" are combined using a semicolon octet (0x3b) rather than a comma; see Section 8.1.2.5 of [H2].

This format provides fixed locations for content that would be carried in HTTP/2 pseudo-fields. Therefore, there is no need to include field lines containing a name of ":method", ":scheme", ":authority", ":path", or ":status". Fields that contain one of these names cause the message to be invalid; see Section 4. Pseudo-fields that are defined by protocol extensions MAY be included, however field lines containing pseudo-fields MUST precede other field lines.

3.7. Content

The content of messages is a sequence of bytes of any length. Though a known-length message has a limit, this limit is large enough that it is unlikely to be a practical limitation. There is no limit to an indeterminate length message.

Omitting content by truncating a message is only possible if the content is zero-length.

4. Invalid Messages

This document describes a number of ways that a message can be invalid. Invalid messages MUST NOT be processed except to log an error and produce an error response.

The format is designed to allow incremental processing. Implementations need to be aware of the possibility that an error might be detected after performing incremental processing.

5. Examples

This section includes example requests and responses encoded in both known-length and indefinite-length forms.

5.1. Request Example

The example HTTP/1.1 message in Figure 7 shows the content of a "message/http".

Valid HTTP/1.1 messages require lines terminated with CRLF (the two bytes 0x0a and 0x0d). For simplicity and consistent, the content of these examples is limited to text, which also uses CRLF for line endings.
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

Figure 7: Sample HTTP Request

This can be expressed as a binary message (type "message/bhttp") using a known-length encoding as shown in hexadecimal in Figure 8. Figure 8 view includes some of the text alongside to show that most of the content is not modified.

00034745 54056874 74707300 0a2f6865  ..GET.https../he
6c666f6f 2e73746f 707300 2c757365 616765  lo.txt@.user-ag
6e743463 302f372e 31362e33 206c6962 6375726c  ent4curl/7.16.3
206c6962 6375726c 2f372e31 362e3320  libcurl/7.16.3
4f70656e 53534c2f 302e392e 7a6c6962 2f312e32  OpenSSL/0.9.7l z
6e656574 6c656574 75616765 06656e2c  accept-language.
206d6900 0000

Figure 8: Known-Length Binary Encoding of Request

This example shows that the Host header field is not replicated in the :authority field, as is required for ensuring that the request is reproduced accurately; see Section 8.1.2.3 of [H2].

The same message can be truncated with no effect on interpretation. In this case, the last two bytes - corresponding to content and a trailer section - can each be removed without altering the semantics of the message.

The same message, encoded using an indefinite-length encoding is shown in Figure 9. As the content of this message is empty, the difference in formats is negligible.

02034745 54056874 74707300 0a2f6865  ..GET.https../he
6c666f6f 2e73746f 707300 2c757365 616765  lo.txt@.user-ag
6e743463 302f372e 31362e33 206c6962 6375726c  ent4curl/7.16.3 l
69626375 726c2f37 2e31362e 33204f70  ibcurl/7.16.3 Op
656e5353 4c2f302e 392e7a6c 6565742d  enSSL/0.9.7l z
622f312e 322e3304 686f7374 0f777777  b/1.2.3.host.www
2e657861 6d706c65 2e636f6d 0f61636f  .example.com.acc
6570742d 6c616667 75616765 06656e2c  accept-language.
206d6900 0000

Figure 9: Indefinite-Length Binary Encoding of Request
This indefinite-length encoding can be truncated by two bytes in the same way.

5.2. Response Example

Response messages can contain interim (1xx) status codes as the message in Figure 10 shows. Figure 10 includes examples of informational status codes defined in [RFC2518] and [RFC8297].

HTTP/1.1 102 Processing
Running: "sleep 15"

HTTP/1.1 103 Early Hints
Link: </style.css>; rel=preload; as=style
Link: </script.js>; rel=preload; as=script

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

Hello World! My content includes a trailing CRLF.

Figure 10: Sample HTTP Response

As this is a longer example, only the indefinite-length encoding is shown in Figure 11. Note here that the specific text used in the reason phrase is not retained by this encoding.
Figure 11: Binary Response including Interim Responses

A response that uses the chunked encoding (Section 7.1 of [MESSAGING]) as shown for Figure 12 can be encoded by preserving chunk boundaries using indefinite-length encoding, which minimizes buffering needed to translate into the binary format. However, these boundaries do not need to be retained and any chunk extensions cannot be conveyed using the binary format.

HTTP/1.1 200 OK
Transfer-Encoding: chunked

0
This
6
cont
13;chunk-extension=foo
nt contains CRLF.

0
Trailer: text

Figure 12: Chunked Encoding Example
Figure 13 shows this message using the known-length coding. Note that the transfer-encoding header field is removed.

0140c800 1d546869 7320636f 6e74656e .@...This conten
7420636f 6e746169 6e732043 524l462e t contains CRLF.
0d0a0d07 74726169 6c657204 74657874 ....trailer.text

Figure 13: Known-Length Encoding of Response

6. "message/bhttp" Media Type

The message/http media 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: bhttp
Required parameters: N/A
Optional parameters: None
Encoding considerations: only "8bit" or "binary" is permitted
Security considerations: see Section 7
Interoperability considerations: N/A
Published specification: this specification
Applications that use this media type: N/A
Fragment identifier considerations: N/A
Additional information: Magic number(s): N/A
Deprecated alias names for this type: N/A
File extension(s): N/A
Macintosh file type code(s): N/A

Person and email address to contact for further information: see Authors’ Addresses section

Intended usage: COMMON
7. Security Considerations

Many of the considerations that apply to HTTP message handling apply to this format; see Section 17 of [HTTP] and Section 11 of [MESSAGING] for common issues in handling HTTP messages.

Strict parsing of the format with no tolerance for errors can help avoid a number of attacks. However, implementations still need to be aware of the possibility of resource exhaustion attacks that might arise from receiving large messages, particularly those with large numbers of fields.

The format is designed to allow for minimal state when translating for use with HTTP proper. However, producing a combined value for fields, which might be necessary for the "Cookie" field when translating this format (like HTTP/1.1 [MESSAGING]), can require the commitment of resources. Implementations need to ensure that they aren’t subject to resource exhaustion attack from a maliciously crafted message.

8. IANA Considerations

Please add the "Media Types" registry at https://www.iana.org/assignments/media-types (https://www.iana.org/assignments/media-types) with the registration information in Section 6 for the media type "message/bhttp".
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1. Introduction

The act of making a request using HTTP reveals information about the client identity to a server. Though the content of requests might reveal information, that is information under the control of the client. In comparison, the source address on the connection reveals information that a client has only limited control over.

Even where an IP address is not directly attributed to an individual, the use of an address over time can be used to correlate requests. Servers are able to use this information to assemble profiles of client behavior, from which they can make inferences about the people involved. The use of persistent connections to make multiple requests improves performance, but provides servers with additional certainty about the identity of clients in a similar fashion.

Use of an HTTP proxy can provide a degree of protection against servers correlating requests. Systems like virtual private networks or the Tor network [Dingledine2004], provide other options for clients.

Though the overhead imposed by these methods varies, the cost for each request is significant. Preventing request linkability requires that each request use a completely new TLS connection to the server. At a minimum, this requires an additional round trip to the server in addition to that required by the request. In addition to having high latency, there are significant secondary costs, both in terms of the number of additional bytes exchanged and the CPU cost of cryptographic computations.

This document describes a method of encapsulation for binary HTTP messages [BINARY] using Hybrid Public Key Encryption (HPKE; [HPKE]). This protects the content of both requests and responses and enables a deployment architecture that can separate the identity of a requester from the request.

Though this scheme requires that servers and proxies explicitly support it, this design represents a performance improvement over options that perform just one request in each connection. With limited trust placed in the proxy (see Section 8), clients are assured that requests are not uniquely attributed to them or linked to other requests.
2. Conventions and Definitions

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.

Encapsulated Request: An HTTP request that is encapsulated in an HPKE-encrypted message; see Section 5.1.

Encapsulated Response: An HTTP response that is encapsulated in an HPKE-encrypted message; see Section 5.2.

Oblivious Proxy Resource: An intermediary that forwards requests and responses between clients and a single oblivious request resource.

Oblivious Request Resource: A resource that can receive an encapsulated request, extract the contents of that request, forward it to an oblivious target resource, receive a response, encapsulate that response, then return that response.

Oblivious Target Resource: The resource that is the target of an encapsulated request. This resource logically handles only regular HTTP requests and responses and so might be ignorant of the use of oblivious HTTP to reach it.

This draft includes pseudocode that uses the functions and conventions defined in [HPKE].

Encoding an integer to a sequence of bytes in network byte order is described using the function "encode(n, v)", where "n" is the number of bytes and "v" is the integer value. The function "len()" returns the length of a sequence of bytes.

Formats are described using notation from Section 1.3 of [QUIC].

3. Overview

A client learns the following:

* The identity of an oblivious request resource. This might include some information about oblivious target resources that the oblivious request resource supports.

* The details of an HPKE public key that the oblivious request resource accepts, including an identifier for that key and the HPKE algorithms that are used with that key.
* The identity of an oblivious proxy resource that will forward encapsulated requests and responses to the oblivious request resource.

This information allows the client to make a request of an oblivious target resource without that resource having only a limited ability to correlate that request with the client IP or other requests that the client might make to that server.

**Figure 1: Overview of Oblivious HTTP**

In order to make a request to an oblivious target resource, the following steps occur, as shown in Figure 1:

1. The client constructs an HTTP request for an oblivious target resource.

2. The client encodes the HTTP request in a binary HTTP message and then encapsulates that message using HPKE and the process from Section 5.1.

3. The client sends a POST request to the oblivious proxy resource with the encapsulated request as the content of that message.

4. The oblivious proxy resource forwards this request to the oblivious request resource.
5. The oblivious request resource receives this request and removes the HPKE protection to obtain an HTTP request.

6. The oblivious request resource makes an HTTP request that includes the target URI, method, fields, and content of the request it acquires.

7. The oblivious target resource answers this HTTP request with an HTTP response.

8. The oblivious request resource encapsulates the HTTP response following the process in Section 5.2 and sends this in response to the request from the oblivious proxy resource.

9. The oblivious proxy resource forwards this response to the client.

10. The client removes the encapsulation to obtain the response to the original request.

3.1. Applicability

Oblivious HTTP has limited applicability. Many uses of HTTP benefit from being able to carry state between requests, such as with cookies ([RFC6265]), authentication (Section 11 of [HTTP]), or even alternative services ([RFC7838]). Oblivious HTTP seeks to prevent this sort of linkage, which requires that applications not carry state between requests.

Oblivious HTTP is primarily useful where privacy risks associated with possible stateful treatment of requests are sufficiently negative that the cost of deploying this protocol can be justified. Oblivious HTTP is simpler and less costly than more robust systems, like Prio ([PRIO]) or Tor ([Dingledine2004]), which can provide stronger guarantees at higher operational costs.

Oblivious HTTP is more costly than a direct connection to a server. Some costs, like those involved with connection setup, can be amortized, but there are several ways in which oblivious HTTP is more expensive than a direct request:

* Each oblivious request requires at least two regular HTTP requests, which adds latency.

* Each request is expanded in size with additional HTTP fields, encryption-related metadata, and AEAD expansion.
Deriving cryptographic keys and applying them for request and response protection takes non-negligible computational resources.

Examples of where preventing the linking of requests might justify these costs include:

* DNS queries. DNS queries made to a recursive resolver reveal information about the requester, particularly if linked to other queries.

* Telemetry submission. Applications that submit reports about their usage to their developers might use oblivious HTTP for some types of moderately sensitive data.

4. Key Configuration

A client needs to acquire information about the key configuration of the oblivious request resource in order to send encapsulated requests.

In order to ensure that clients do not encapsulate messages that other entities can intercept, the key configuration MUST be authenticated and have integrity protection.

This document describes the "application/ohttp-keys" media type; see Section 4.2. This media type might be used, for example with HTTPS, as part of a system for configuring or discovering key configurations. Note however that such a system needs to consider the potential for key configuration to be used to compromise client privacy; see Section 9.

Specifying a format for expressing the information a client needs to construct an encapsulated request ensures that different client implementations can be configured in the same way. This also enables advertising key configurations in a consistent format.

A client might have multiple key configurations to select from when encapsulating a request. Clients are responsible for selecting a preferred key configuration from those it supports. Clients need to consider both the key encapsulation method (KEM) and the combinations of key derivation function (KDF) and authenticated encryption with associated data (AEAD) in this decision.

Evolution of the key configuration format is supported through the definition of new formats that are identified by new media types.
4.1. Key Configuration Encoding

A single key configuration consists of a key identifier, a public key, an identifier for the KEM that the public key uses, and a set of HPKE symmetric algorithms. Each symmetric algorithm consists of an identifier for a KDF and an identifier for an AEAD.

Figure 2 shows a single key configuration, KeyConfig, that is expressed using the TLS syntax; see Section 3 of [TLS].

```c
opaque HpkePublicKey[Npk];
uint16 HpkeKemId;
uint16 HpkeKdfId;
uint16 HpkeAeadId;

struct {
    HpkeKdfId kdf_id;
    HpkeAeadId aead_id;
} HpkeSymmetricAlgorithms;

struct {
    uint8 key_id;
    HpkeKemId kem_id;
    HpkePublicKey public_key;
    HpkeSymmetricAlgorithms cipher_suites<4..2^16-4>;
} KeyConfig;
```

Figure 2: A Single Key Configuration

The types HpkeKemId, HpkeKdfId, and HpkeAeadId identify a KEM, KDF, and AEAD respectively. The definitions for these identifiers and the semantics of the algorithms they identify can be found in [HPKE]. The Npk parameter corresponding to the HpkeKdfId can be found in [HPKE].

4.2. Key Configuration Media Type

The "application/ohttp-keys" format is a media type that identifies a serialized collection of key configurations. The content of this media type comprises one or more key configuration encodings (see Section 4.1) that are concatenated.

Type name: application

Subtype name: ohttp-keys

Required parameters: N/A
5. HPKE Encapsulation

HTTP message encapsulation uses HPKE for request and response encryption. An encapsulated HTTP message includes the following values:

1. A binary-encoded HTTP message; see [BINARY].
2. Padding of arbitrary length which MUST contain all zeroes.

The encoding of an HTTP message is as follows:
Plaintext Message {
    Message Length (i),
    Message (..),
    Padding Length (i),
    Padding (..),
}

An Encapsulated Request is comprised of a length-prefixed key identifier and a HPKE-protected request message. HPKE protection includes an encapsulated KEM shared secret (or "enc"), plus the AEAD-protected request message. An Encapsulated Request is shown in Figure 3. Section 5.1 describes the process for constructing and processing an Encapsulated Request.

Encapsulated Request {
    Key Identifier (8),
    KEM Identifier (16),
    KDF Identifier (16),
    AEAD Identifier (16),
    Encapsulated KEM Shared Secret (8*Nenc),
    AEAD-Protected Request (..),
}

Figure 3: Encapsulated Request

The Nenc parameter corresponding to the HpkeKdfId can be found in [HPKE].

Responses are bound to responses and so consist only of AEAD-protected content. Section 5.2 describes the process for constructing and processing an Encapsulated Response.

Encapsulated Response {
    Nonce (Nk),
    AEAD-Protected Response (..),
}

Figure 4: Encapsulated Response

The size of the Nonce field in an Encapsulated Response corresponds to the size of an AEAD key for the corresponding HPKE ciphersuite.

5.1. Encapsulation of Requests

Clients encapsulate a request "request" using values from a key configuration:
the key identifier from the configuration, "keyID", with the corresponding KEM identified by "kemID",

* the public key from the configuration, "pkR", and

* a selected combination of KDF, identified by "kdfID", and AEAD, identified by "aeadID".

The client then constructs an encapsulated request, "enc_request", as follows:

1. Compute an HPKE context using "pkR", yielding "context" and encapsulation key "enc".

2. Construct associated data, "aad", by concatenating the values of "keyID", "kemID", "kdfID", and "aeadID", as one 8-bit integer and three 16-bit integers, respectively, each in network byte order.

3. Encrypt (seal) "request" with "aad" as associated data using "context", yielding ciphertext "ct".

4. Concatenate the values of "aad", "enc", and "ct", yielding an Encapsulated Request "enc_request".

Note that "enc" is of fixed-length, so there is no ambiguity in parsing this structure.

In pseudocode, this procedure is as follows:

```plaintext
cenc, context = SetupBaseS(pkR, "request")
aad = concat(encode(1, keyID),
            encode(2, kemID),
            encode(2, kdfID),
            encode(2, aeadID))
ct = context.Seal(aad, request)
enc_request = concat(aad, enc, ct)
```

Servers decrypt an Encapsulated Request by reversing this process. Given an Encapsulated Request "enc_request", a server:

1. Parses "enc_request" into "keyID", "kemID", "kdfID", "aeadID", "enc", and "ct" (indicated using the function "parse()" in pseudocode). The server is then able to find the HPKE private key, "skR", corresponding to "keyID".

   a. If "keyID" does not identify a key matching the type of "kemID", the server returns an error.
2. If "kdfID" and "aeadID" identify a combination of KDF and AEAD that the server is unwilling to use with "skR", the server returns an error.

2. Compute an HPKE context using "skR" and the encapsulated key "enc", yielding "context".

3. Construct additional associated data, "aad", from "keyID", "kdfID", and "aeadID" or as the first five bytes of "enc_request".

4. Decrypt "ct" using "aad" as associated data, yielding "request" or an error on failure. If decryption fails, the server returns an error.

In pseudocode, this procedure is as follows:

keyID, kemID, kdfID, aeadID, enc, ct = parse(enc_request)
aad = concat(encode(1, keyID),
          encode(2, kemID),
          encode(2, kdfID),
          encode(2, aeadID))
context = SetupBaseR(enc, skR, "request")
request, error = context.Open(aad, ct)

5.2. Encapsulation of Responses

Given an HPKE context "context", a request message "request", and a response "response", servers generate an Encapsulated Response "enc_response" as follows:

1. Export a secret "secret" from "context", using the string "response" as context. The length of this secret is "max(Nn, Nk)", where "Nn" and "Nk" are the length of AEAD key and nonce associated with "context".

2. Generate a random value of length "max(Nn, Nk)" bytes, called "response_nonce".

3. Extract a pseudorandom key "prk" using the "Extract" function provided by the KDF algorithm associated with "context". The "ikm" input to this function is "secret"; the "salt" input is the concatenation of "enc" (from "enc_request") and "response_nonce"

4. Use the "Expand" function provided by the same KDF to extract an AEAD key "key", of length "Nk" - the length of the keys used by the AEAD associated with "context". Generating "key" uses a label of "key".
5. Use the same "Expand" function to extract a nonce "nonce" of length "Nn" - the length of the nonce used by the AEAD. Generating "nonce" uses a label of "nonce".

6. Encrypt "response", passing the AEAD function Seal the values of "key", "nonce", empty "aad", and a "pt" input of "request", which yields "ct".

7. Concatenate "response_nonce" and "ct", yielding an Encapsulated Response "enc_response". Note that "response_nonce" is of fixed-length, so there is no ambiguity in parsing either "response_nonce" or "ct".

In pseudocode, this procedure is as follows:

```
secret = context.Export("response", Nk)
response_nonce = random(max(Nn, Nk))
salt = concat(enc, response_nonce)
prk = Extract(salt, secret)
aead_key = Expand(prk, "key", Nk)
aead_nonce = Expand(prk, "nonce", Nn)
ct = Seal(aead_key, aead_nonce, ",", request)
enc_response = concat(response_nonce, ct)
```

Clients decrypt an Encapsulated Request by reversing this process. That is, they first parse "enc_response" into "response_nonce" and "ct". They then follow the same process to derive values for "aead_key" and "aead_nonce".

The client uses these values to decrypt "ct" using the Open function provided by the AEAD. Decrypting might produce an error, as follows:

```
response, error = Open(aead_key, aead_nonce, ",", ct)
```

6. HTTP Usage

A client interacts with the oblivious proxy resource by constructing an encapsulated request. This encapsulated request is included as the content of a POST request to the oblivious proxy resource. This request MUST only contain those fields necessary to carry the encapsulated request: a method of POST, a target URI of the oblivious proxy resource, a header field containing the content type (see (Section 7), and the encapsulated request as the request content. Clients MAY include fields that do not reveal information about the content of the request, such as Alt-Used [ALT-SVC], or information that it trusts the oblivious proxy resource to remove, such as fields that are listed in the Connection header field.
The oblivious proxy resource interacts with the oblivious request resource by constructing a request using the same restrictions as the client request, except that the target URI is the oblivious request resource. The content of this request is copied from the client. The oblivious proxy resource MUST NOT add information about the client to this request.

When a response is received from the oblivious request resource, the oblivious proxy resource forwards the response according to the rules of an HTTP proxy; see Section 7.6 of [HTTP].

An oblivious request resource, if it receives any response from the oblivious target resource, sends a single 200 response containing the encapsulated response. Like the request from the client, this response MUST only contain those fields necessary to carry the encapsulated response: a 200 status code, a header field indicating the content type, and the encapsulated response as the response content. As with requests, additional fields MAY be used to convey information that does not reveal information about the encapsulated response.

An oblivious request resource acts as a gateway for requests to the oblivious target resource (see Section 7.6 of [HTTP]). The one exception is that any information it might forward in a response MUST be encapsulated, unless it is responding to errors it detects before removing encapsulation of the request; see Section 6.2.

6.1. Informational Responses

This encapsulation does not permit progressive processing of responses. Though the binary HTTP response format does support the inclusion of informational (1xx) status codes, the AEAD encapsulation cannot be removed until the entire message is received.

In particular, the Expect header field with 100-continue (see Section 10.1.1 of [HTTP]) cannot be used. Clients MUST NOT construct a request that includes a 100-continue expectation; the oblivious request resource MUST generate an error if a 100-continue expectation is received.

6.2. Errors

A server that receives an invalid message for any reason MUST generate an HTTP response with a 4xx status code.
Errors detected by the oblivious proxy resource and errors detected by the oblivious request resource before removing protection (including being unable to remove encapsulation for any reason) result in the status code being sent without protection in response to the POST request made to that resource.

Errors detected by the oblivious request resource after successfully removing encapsulation and errors detected by the oblivious target resource MUST be sent in an encapsulated response.

7. Media Types

Media types are used to identify encapsulated requests and responses.

Evolution of the format of encapsulated requests and responses is supported through the definition of new formats that are identified by new media types.

7.1. message/ohttp-req Media Type

The "message/ohttp-req" identifies an encapsulated binary HTTP request. This is a binary format that is defined in Section 5.1.

Type name: message
Subtype name: ohttp-req
Required parameters: N/A
Optional parameters: None
Encoding considerations: only "8bit" or "binary" is permitted
Security considerations: see Section 8
Interoperability considerations: N/A
Published specification: this specification
Applications that use this media type: N/A
Fragment identifier considerations: N/A
Additional information: Magic number(s): N/A
Deprecation/alias name: N/A
File extension(s): N/A
7.2.  message/ohttp-res Media Type

The "message/ohttp-res" identifies an encapsulated binary HTTP response. This is a binary format that is defined in Section 5.2.

Type name:   message
Subtype name:  ohttp-res
Required parameters:  N/A
Optional parameters:  None
Encoding considerations:  only "8bit" or "binary" is permitted
Security considerations:  see Section 8
Interoperability considerations:  N/A
Published specification:  this specification
Applications that use this media type:  N/A
Fragment identifier considerations:  N/A
Additional information:  Magic number(s):  N/A
                         Deprecated alias names for this type:  N/A
                         File extension(s):  N/A
                         Macintosh file type code(s):  N/A

Person and email address to contact for further information:  see Authors’ Addresses section
8. Security Considerations

In this design, a client wishes to make a request of a server that is authoritative for the oblivious target resource. The client wishes to make this request without linking that request with either:

1. The identity at the network and transport layer of the client (that is, the client IP address and TCP or UDP port number the client uses to create a connection).

2. Any other request the client might have made in the past or might make in the future.

In order to ensure this, the client selects a proxy (that serves the oblivious proxy resource) that it trusts will protect this information by forwarding the encapsulated request and response without passing the server (that serves the oblivious request resource).

In this section, a deployment where there are three entities is considered:

* A client makes requests and receives responses

* A proxy operates the oblivious proxy resource

* A server operates both the oblivious request resource and the oblivious target resource

To achieve the stated privacy goals, the oblivious proxy resource cannot be operated by the same entity as the oblivious request resource. However, colocation of the oblivious request resource and oblivious target resource simplifies the interactions between those resources without affecting client privacy.

As a consequence of this configuration, Oblivious HTTP prevents linkability described above. Informally, this means:
1. Requests and responses are known only to clients and targets in possession of the corresponding response encapsulation key and HPKE keying material. In particular, the oblivious proxy knows the origin and destination of an encapsulated request and response, yet does not know the decapsulated contents. Likewise, targets know only the oblivious request origin, i.e., the proxy, and the decapsulated request. Only the client knows both the plaintext request and response.

2. Targets cannot link requests from the same client in the absence of unique per-client keys.

Traffic analysis that might affect these properties are outside the scope of this document; see Section 8.2.2.

A formal analysis of Oblivious HTTP is in [OHTTP-ANALYSIS].

8.1. Client Responsibilities

Clients MUST ensure that the key configuration they select for generating encapsulated requests is integrity protected and authenticated so that it can be attributed to the oblivious request resource; see Section 4.

Since clients connect directly to the proxy instead of the target, application configurations wherein clients make policy decisions about target connections, e.g., to apply certificate pinning, are incompatible with Oblivious HTTP. In such cases, alternative technologies such as HTTP CONNECT (Section 9.3.6 of [HTTP]) can be used. Applications could implement related policies on key configurations and proxy connections, though these might not provide the same properties as policies enforced directly on target connections. When this difference is relevant, applications can instead connect directly to the target at the cost of either privacy or performance.

Clients MUST NOT include identifying information in the request that is encapsulated. Identifying information includes cookies [COOKIES], authentication credentials or tokens, and any information that might reveal client-specific information such as account credentials.
Clients cannot carry connection-level state between requests as they only establish direct connections to the proxy responsible for the oblivious proxy resource. However, clients need to ensure that they construct requests without any information gained from previous requests. Otherwise, the server might be able to use that information to link requests. Cookies [COOKIES] are the most obvious feature that MUST NOT be used by clients. However, clients need to include all information learned from requests, which could include the identity of resources.

Clients MUST generate a new HPKE context for every request, using a good source of entropy ([RANDOM]) for generating keys. Key reuse not only risks requests being linked, reuse could expose request and response contents to the proxy.

The request the client sends to the oblivious proxy resource only requires minimal information; see Section 6. The request that carries the encapsulated request and is sent to the oblivious proxy resource MUST NOT include identifying information unless the client ensures that this information is removed by the proxy. A client MAY include information only for the oblivious proxy resource in header fields identified by the Connection header field if it trusts the proxy to remove these as required by Section 7.6.1 of [HTTP]. The client needs to trust that the proxy does not replicate the source addressing information in the request it forwards.

Clients rely on the oblivious proxy resource to forward encapsulated requests and responses. However, the proxy can only refuse to forward messages, it cannot inspect or modify the contents of encapsulated requests or responses.

8.2. Proxy Responsibilities

The proxy that serves the oblivious proxy resource has a very simple function to perform. For each request it receives, it makes a request of the oblivious request resource that includes the same content. When it receives a response, it sends a response to the client that includes the content of the response from the oblivious request resource. When generating a request, the proxy MUST follow the forwarding rules in Section 7.6 of [HTTP].

A proxy can also generate responses, though it assumed to not be able to examine the content of a request (other than to observe the choice of key identifier, KDF, and AEAD), so it is also assumed that it cannot generate an encapsulated response.
A proxy MUST NOT add information about the client identity when forwarding requests. This includes the Via field, the Forwarded field [FORWARDED], and any similar information. A client does not depend on the proxy using an authenticated and encrypted connection to the oblivious request resource, only that information about the client not be attached to forwarded requests.

8.2.1. Denial of Service

As there are privacy benefits from having a large rate of requests forwarded by the same proxy (see Section 8.2.2), servers that operate the oblivious request resource might need an arrangement with proxies. This arrangement might be necessary to prevent having the large volume of requests being classified as an attack by the server.

If a server accepts a larger volume of requests from a proxy, it needs to trust that the proxy does not allow abusive levels of request volumes from clients. That is, if a server allows requests from the proxy to be exempt from rate limits, the server might want to ensure that the proxy applies a rate limiting policy that is acceptable to the server.

Servers that enter into an agreement with a proxy that enables a higher request rate might choose to authenticate the proxy to enable the higher rate.

8.2.2. Linkability Through Traffic Analysis

As the time at which encapsulated request or response messages are sent can reveal information to a network observer. Though messages exchanged between the oblivious proxy resource and the oblivious request resource might be sent in a single connection, traffic analysis could be used to match messages that are forwarded by the proxy.

A proxy could, as part of its function, add delays in order to increase the anonymity set into which each message is attributed. This could latency to the overall time clients take to receive a response, which might not be what some clients want.

A proxy can use padding to reduce the effectiveness of traffic analysis.

A proxy that forwards large volumes of exchanges can provide better privacy by providing larger sets of messages that need to be matched.
8.3. Server Responsibilities

A server that operates both oblivious request and oblivious target resources is responsible for removing request encapsulation, generating a response the encapsulated request, and encapsulating the response.

Servers should account for traffic analysis based on response size or generation time. Techniques such as padding or timing delays can help protect against such attacks; see Section 8.2.2.

If separate entities provide the oblivious request resource and oblivious target resource, these entities might need an arrangement similar to that between server and proxy for managing denial of service; see Section 8.2.1. It is also necessary to provide confidentiality protection for the unprotected requests and responses, plus protections for traffic analysis; see Section 8.2.2.

An oblivious request resource needs to have a plan for replacing keys. This might include regular replacement of keys, which can be assigned new key identifiers. If an oblivious request resource receives a request that contains a key identifier that it does not understand or that corresponds to a key that has been replaced, the server can respond with an HTTP 422 (Unprocessable Content) status code.

A server can also use a 422 status code if the server has a key that corresponds to the key identifier, but the encapsulated request cannot be successfully decrypted using the key.

8.4. Replay Attacks

Encapsulated requests can be copied and replayed by the oblivious proxy resource. The design of oblivious HTTP does not assume that the oblivious proxy resource will not replay requests. In addition, if a client sends an encapsulated request in TLS early data (see Section 8 of [TLS] and [RFC8470]), a network-based adversary might be able to cause the request to be replayed. In both cases, the effect of a replay attack and the mitigations that might be employed are similar to TLS early data.
A client or oblivious proxy resource MUST NOT automatically attempt to retry a failed request unless it receives a positive signal indicating that the request was not processed or forwarded. The HTTP/2 REFUSED_STREAM error code (Section 8.1.4 of [RFC7540]), the HTTP/3 H3_REQUEST_REJECTED error code (Section 8.1 of [QUIC-HTTP]), or a GOAWAY frame with a low enough identifier (in either protocol version) are all sufficient signals that no processing occurred. Connection failures or interruptions are not sufficient signals that no processing occurred.

The anti-replay mechanisms described in Section 8 of [TLS] are generally applicable to oblivious HTTP requests. Servers can use the encapsulated keying material as a unique key for identifying potential replays. This depends on clients generating a new HPKE context for every request.

The mechanism used in TLS for managing differences in client and server clocks cannot be used as it depends on being able to observe previous interactions. Oblivious HTTP explicitly prevents such linkability. Applications can still include an explicit indication of time to limit the span of time over which a server might need to track accepted requests. Clock information could be used for client identification, so reduction in precision or obfuscation might be necessary.

The considerations in [RFC8470] as they relate to managing the risk of replay also apply, though there is no option to delay the processing of a request.

Limiting requests to those with safe methods might not be satisfactory for some applications, particularly those that involve the submission of data to a server. The use of idempotent methods might be of some use in managing replay risk, though it is important to recognize that different idempotent requests can be combined to be not idempotent.

Idempotent actions with a narrow scope based on the value of a protected nonce could enable data submission with limited replay exposure. A nonce might be added as an explicit part of a request, or, if the oblivious request and target resources are co-located, the encapsulated keying material can be used to produce a nonce.

The server-chosen "response_nonce" field ensures that responses have unique AEAD keys and nonces even when requests are replayed.
8.5. Post-Compromise Security

This design does not provide post-compromise security for responses. A client only needs to retain keying material that might be used to compromise the confidentiality and integrity of a response until that response is consumed, so there is negligible risk associated with a client compromise.

A server retains a secret key that might be used to remove protection from messages over much longer periods. A server compromise that provided access to the oblivious request resource secret key could allow an attacker to recover the plaintext of all requests sent toward affected keys and all of the responses that were generated. Accessing requests and responses also requires access to requests and responses, which implies either compromise of TLS connections or collusion with the oblivious proxy resource.

The total number of affected messages affected by server key compromise can be limited by regular rotation of server keys.

9. Privacy Considerations

One goal of this design is that independent client requests are only linkable by the chosen key configuration. The oblivious proxy and request resources can link requests using the same key configuration by matching KeyConfig.key_id, or, if the oblivious target resource is willing to use trial decryption, a limited set of key configurations that share an identifier. An oblivious proxy can link requests using the public key corresponding to KeyConfig.key_id.

Request resources are capable of linking requests depending on how KeyConfigs are produced by servers and discovered by clients. Specifically, servers can maliciously construct key configurations to track individual clients. A specific method for a client to acquire key configurations is not included in this specification. Clients need to consider these tracking vectors when choosing a discovery method. Applications using this design should provide accommodations to mitigate tracking use key configurations.

10. Operational and Deployment Considerations

Using Oblivious HTTP adds both cryptographic and latency to requests relative to a simple HTTP request-response exchange. Deploying proxy services that are on path between clients and servers avoids adding significant additional delay due to network topology. A study of a similar system [ODoH] found that deploying proxies close to servers was most effective in minimizing additional latency.
Oblivious HTTP might be incompatible with network interception regimes, such as those that rely on configuring clients with trust anchors and intercepting TLS connections. While TLS might be intercepted successfully, interception middleboxes devices might not receive updates that would allow Oblivious HTTP to be correctly identified using the media types defined in Section 7.

Oblivious HTTP has a simple key management design that is not trivially altered to enable interception by intermediaries. Clients that are configured to enable interception might choose to disable Oblivious HTTP in order to ensure that content is accessible to middleboxes.

11. IANA Considerations

Please update the "Media Types" registry at https://www.iana.org/assignments/media-types (https://www.iana.org/assignments/media-types) with the registration information in Section 7 for the media types "message/ohttp-req", "message/ohttp-res", and "application/ohttp-keys".
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Appendix A. Complete Example of a Request and Response

A single request and response exchange is shown here. Binary values (key configuration, secret keys, the content of messages, and intermediate values) are shown in hexadecimal. The request and response here are absolutely minimal; the purpose of this example is to show the cryptographic operations.

The oblivious request resource generates a key pair. In this example the server chooses DHKEM(X25519, HKDF-SHA256) and generates an X25519 key pair [X25519]. The X25519 secret key is:

cb14d538a70d8a74d47fb7e3ac5052a086da127c678d3585dcad72f98e3bff83

The oblivious request resource constructs a key configuration that includes the corresponding public key as follows:

01002012a45279412ea6ef11e9f839bb5a422fc1262b5c023d787e4e636e70ae
d3d56e000800001000100010003

This key configuration is somehow obtained by the client. Then when a client wishes to send an HTTP request of a GET request to "https://example.com", it constructs the following binary HTTP message:

00034745540568747470730b6578616d706c652e636f6d012f

The client then reads the oblivious request resource key configuration and selects a mutually supported KDF and AEAD. In this example, the client selects HKDF-SHA256 and AES-128-GCM. The client then generates an HPKE context that uses the server public key. This results in the following encapsulated key:

cd7786fd75143f12e03398dbe2bcfa8e01a8132e7b66050674db72730623ca3b

The corresponding private key is:

c20afd33a2f2663faf023acf5d56fc08fdd38aada29b21b3b96e16f4326ccf7

Applying the Seal operation from the HPKE context produces an encrypted message, allowing the client to construct the following encapsulated request:

01002000010001cd7786fd75143f12e03398dbe2bcfa8e01a8132e7b66050674
db72730623ca3b68b9e75a0576745da12c4fa5053b7ec06d7f625197564a6087
ecc99f8d6fffa2a8addfc1c0f64b4b05
The client then sends this to the oblivious proxy resource in a POST request, which might look like the following HTTP/1.1 request:

```
POST /request.example.net/proxy HTTP/1.1
Host: proxy.example.org
Content-Type: message/ohttp-req
Content-Length: 78

<content is the encapsulated request above>
```

The oblivious proxy resource receives this request and forwards it to the oblivious request resource, which might look like:

```
POST /oblivious/request HTTP/1.1
Host: example.com
Content-Type: message/ohttp-req
Content-Length: 78

<content is the encapsulated request above>
```

The oblivious request resource receives this request, selects the key it generated previously using the key identifier from the message, and decrypts the message. As this request is directed to the same server, the oblivious request resource does not need to initiate an HTTP request to the oblivious target resource. The request can be served directly by the oblivious target resource, which generates a minimal response (consisting of just a 200 status code) as follows:

```
0140c8
```

The response is constructed by extracting a secret from the HPKE context:

```
9c0b96b577b9fc7a5beef536e0ff3a64
```

The key derivation for the encapsulated response uses both the encapsulated KEM key from the request and a randomly selected nonce. This produces a salt of:

```
cd7786fd75143f12e03398dce2bcfa8e01a8132e7b66050674db72730623ca3b061d62d5df5832c6c9fa4617ce848a7
```

The salt and secret are both passed to the Extract function of the selected KDF (HKDF-SHA256) to produce a pseudorandom key of:

```
a0ab55d3b1811694943bb72c386f59bd030e1278692a3db2f30d8a9c2f89a5fc
```
The pseudorandom key is used with the Expand function of the KDF and an info field of "key" to produce a 16-byte key for the selected AEAD (AES-128-GCM):

1dae9d7fe263d23e51a768bcafe310aa5

With the same KDF and pseudorandom key, an info field of "nonce" is used to generate a 12-byte nonce:

e520beec147740e4f8a3b553

The AEAD Seal function is then used to encrypt the response, which is added to the randomized nonce value to produce the encapsulated response:

061d62d5df5832c6c9fa4617ceb848a7a6f694da45acc3c32ad576cb204f7cd3bf23e

The oblivious request resource then constructs a response:

HTTP/1.1 200 OK
Date: Wed, 27 Jan 2021 04:45:07 GMT
Cache-Control: private, no-store
Content-Type: message/ohttp-res
Content-Length: 38

<content is the encapsulated response>

The same response might then be generated by the oblivious proxy resource which might change as little as the Date header. The client is then able to use the HPKE context it created and the nonce from the encapsulated response to construct the AEAD key and nonce and decrypt the response.
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