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Abstract

The HTTP Deprecation Response Header Field can be used to signal to consumers of a URI-identified resource that the resource has been deprecated. Additionally, the deprecation link relation can be used to link to a resource that provides additional context for the deprecation, and possibly ways in which clients can find a replacement for the deprecated resource.
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1. Introduction

Deprecation of an HTTP resource as defined in Section 2 of [RFC7231] is a technique to communicate information about the lifecycle of a resource. It encourages applications to migrate away from the resource, discourages applications from forming new dependencies on the resource, and informs applications about the risk of continuing dependence upon the resource.

The act of deprecation does not change any behavior of the resource. It just informs client of the fact that a resource is deprecated. The Deprecation HTTP response header field MAY be used to convey this fact at runtime to clients. The header field can carry information indicating since when the deprecation is in effect.

In addition to the Deprecation header field the resource provider can use other header fields to convey additional information related to deprecation. For example, information such as where to find documentation related to the deprecation or what should be used as an
alternate and when the deprecated resource would be unreachable, etc. Alternates of a resource can be similar resource(s) or a newer version of the same resource.

1.1. Notational Conventions

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "NOT RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in BCP 14 [RFC2119] [RFC8174] when, and only when, they appear in all capitals, as shown here.

This specification uses the Augmented Backus-Naur Form (ABNF) notation of [RFC5234] and includes, by reference, the IMF-fixdate rule as defined in Section 7.1.1.1 of [RFC7231].

The term "resource" is to be interpreted as defined in Section 2 of [RFC7231], that is identified by an URI.

2. The Deprecation HTTP Response Header

The "Deprecation" HTTP response header field allows a server to communicate to a client that the resource in context of the message is or will be deprecated.

2.1. Syntax

The "Deprecation" response header field describes the deprecation. It either shows the deprecation date, which may be in the future (the resource context will be deprecated at that date) or in the past (the resource context has been deprecated at that date), or it simply flags the resource context as being deprecated:

Deprecation = IMF-fixdate / "true"

Servers MUST NOT include more than one "Deprecation" header field in the same response.

The date, if present, is the date when the resource context was or will be deprecated. It is in the form of an IMF-fixdate timestamp.

The following example shows that the resource context has been deprecated on Sunday, November 11, 2018 at 23:59:59 GMT:

Deprecation: Sun, 11 Nov 2018 23:59:59 GMT
The deprecation date can be in the future. If the value of "date" is in the future, it means that the resource will be deprecated at the given date in future.

If the deprecation date is not known, the header field can carry the simple string "true", indicating that the resource context is deprecated, without indicating when that happened:

Deprecation: true

2.2. Scope

The Deprecation header field applies to the resource that returns it, meaning that it announces the upcoming deprecation of that specific resource. However, there may be scenarios where the scope of the announced deprecation is larger than just the single resource where it appears.

Resources are free to define such an increased scope, and usually this scope will be documented by the resource so that consumers of the resource know about the increased scope and can behave accordingly. However, it is important to take into account that such increased scoping is invisible for consumers who are unaware of the increased scoping rules. This means that these consumers will not be aware of the increased scope, and they will not interpret Deprecation information different from its standard meaning (i.e., it applies to the resource only).

Using such an increased scope still may make sense, as Deprecation information is only a hint anyway; thus, it is optional information that cannot be depended on, and clients should always be implemented in ways that allow them to function without Deprecation information. Increased scope information may help clients to glean additional hints from resources and, thus, might allow them to implement behavior that allows them to make educated guesses about resources becoming deprecated.

3. The Deprecation Link Relation Type

In addition to the Deprecation HTTP header field, the server can use links with the "deprecation" link relation type to communicate to the client where to find more information about deprecation of the context. This can happen before the actual deprecation, to make a deprecation policy discoverable, or after deprecation, when there may be documentation about the deprecation, and possibly documentation of how to manage it.
This specification places no restrictions on the representation of the interlinked deprecation policy. In particular, the deprecation policy may be available as human-readable documentation or as machine-readable description.

3.1. Documentation

For a resource, deprecation could involve one or more parts of request, response or both. These parts could be one or more of the following.

- URI - deprecation of one or more query parameter(s) or path element(s)
- method - HTTP method for the resource is deprecated
- request header - one or more HTTP request header(s) is deprecated
- response header - HTTP response header(s) is deprecated
- request body - request body contains one or more deprecated element(s)
- response body - response body contains one or more deprecated element(s)

The purpose of the "Deprecation" header is to provide just enough "hints" about the deprecation to the client application developer. It is safe to assume that on reception of the "Deprecation" header, the client developer would look up the resource’s documentation in order to find deprecation related semantics. The resource developer could provide a link to the resource documentation using a "Link" header with relation type "deprecation" as shown below.

Link: <https://developer.example.com/deprecation>; rel="deprecation"; type="text/html"

In this example the interlinked content provides additional information about the deprecation of the resource context. There is no Deprecation header field in the response, and thus the resource is not deprecated. However, the resource already exposes a link where information is available how deprecation is managed for the context. This may be documentation explaining the use of the Deprecation header field, and also explaining under which circumstances and with which policies (announcement before deprecation; continued operation after deprecation) deprecation might be happening.
The following example uses the same link header, but also announces a deprecation date using a Deprecation header field.

Deprecation: Sun, 11 Nov 2018 23:59:59 GMT
Link: <https://developer.example.com/deprecation>; rel="deprecation"; type="text/html"

Given that the deprecation date is in the past, the linked resource may have been updated to include information about the deprecation, allowing clients to discover information about the deprecation that happened.

4. Recommend Replacement

The "Link" [RFC8288] header field can be used in addition to the "Deprecation" header field to inform the client about available alternatives to the deprecated resource. The following relation types as defined in [RFC8288] are RECOMMENDED to use for this purpose:

- "successor-version": Points to a resource containing the successor version. [RFC5829]
- "latest-version": Points to a resource containing the latest (e.g., current) version. [RFC5829]
- "alternate": Designates a substitute. [W3C.REC-html401-19991224]

The following example provides link to the successor version of the requested resource that is deprecated.

Deprecation: Sun, 11 Nov 2018 23:59:59 GMT
Link: <https://api.example.com/v2/customers>; rel="successor-version"

This example provides link to an alternate resource to the requested resource that is deprecated.

Deprecation: Sun, 11 Nov 2018 23:59:59 GMT
Link: <https://api.example.com/v1/clients>; rel="alternate"

5. Sunset

In addition to the deprecation related information, if the resource provider wants to convey to the client application that the deprecated resource is expected to become unresponsive at a specific point in time, the Sunset HTTP header field [RFC8594] can be used in addition to the "Deprecation" header.
The timestamp given in the "Sunset" header field MUST be the later or the same as the one given in the "Deprecation" header field.

The following example shows that the resource in context has been deprecated since Sunday, November 11, 2018 at 23:59:59 GMT and its sunset date is Wednesday, November 11, 2020 at 23:59:59 GMT.

Deprecation: Sun, 11 Nov 2018 23:59:59 GMT

6. Resource Behavior

The act of deprecation does not change any behavior of the resource. Deprecated resources SHOULD keep functioning as before, allowing consumers to still use the resources in the same way as they did before the resources were declared deprecated.

7. IANA Considerations

7.1. The Deprecation HTTP Response Header

The "Deprecation" response header should be added to the permanent registry of message header fields (see [RFC3864]), taking into account the guidelines given by HTTP/1.1 [RFC7231].

Header Field Name: Deprecation

Applicable Protocol: Hypertext Transfer Protocol (HTTP)

Status: Standard

Author: Sanjay Dalal <sanjay.dalal@cal.berkeley.edu>,
       Erik Wilde <erik.wilde@dret.net>

Change controller: IETF

Specification document: this specification,
       Section 2 "The Deprecation HTTP Response Header"

7.2. The Deprecation Link Relation Type

The "deprecation" link relation type should be added to the permanent registry of link relation types according to Section 4.2 of [RFC8288]:
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8. Implementation Status

Note to RFC Editor: Please remove this section before publication.

This section records the status of known implementations of the protocol defined by this specification at the time of posting of this Internet-Draft, and is based on a proposal described in [RFC7942]. The description of implementations in this section is intended to assist the IETF in its decision processes in progressing drafts to RFCs. Please note that the listing of any individual implementation here does not imply endorsement by the IETF. Furthermore, no effort has been spent to verify the information presented here that was supplied by IETF contributors. This is not intended as, and must not be construed to be, a catalog of available implementations or their features. Readers are advised to note that other implementations may exist.

According to RFC 7942, "this will allow reviewers and working groups to assign due consideration to documents that have the benefit of running code, which may serve as evidence of valuable experimentation and feedback that have made the implemented protocols more mature. It is up to the individual working groups to use this information as they see fit".

8.1. Implementing the Deprecation Header

This is a list of implementations that implement the deprecation header field:

Organization: Apollo

- Description: Deprecation header is returned when deprecated functionality (as declared in the GraphQL schema) is accessed...
Organization: Zalando

- Description: Deprecation header is recommended as the preferred way to communicate API deprecation in Zalando API designs.
- Reference: https://opensource.zalando.com/restful-api-guidelines/#deprecation

Organization: Palantir Technologies

- Description: Deprecation header is incorporated in code generated by conjure-java, a CLI to generate Java POJOs and interfaces from Conjure API definitions.
- Reference: https://github.com/palantir/conjure-java

Organization: IETF Internet Draft, Registration Protocols Extensions

- Description: Deprecation link relation is returned in Registration Data Access Protocol (RDAP) notices to indicate deprecation of jCard in favor of JSContact.

Organization: E-Voyageurs Technologies

- Description: Deprecation header is incorporated in Hesperides, a configuration management tool providing universal text file templating and properties editing through a REST API or a webapp.

Organization: Open-Xchange

- Description: Deprecation header is used in Open-Xchange appsuite-middleware
- Reference: https://github.com/open-xchange/appsuite-middleware

Organization: MediaWiki
o Description: Core REST API of MediaWiki would use Deprecation header for endpoints that have been deprecated because a new endpoint provides the same or better functionality.

o Reference: https://phabricator.wikimedia.org/T232485

8.2. Implementing the Concept

This is a list of implementations that implement the general concept, but do so using different mechanisms:

Organization: Zapier

o Description: Zapier uses two custom HTTP headers named "X-API-Deprecation-Date" and "X-API-Deprecation-Info"

o Reference: https://zapier.com/engineering/api-geriatrics/

Organization: IBM

o Description: IBM uses a custom HTTP header named "Deprecated"


Organization: Ultipro

o Description: Ultipro uses the HTTP "Warning" header as described in Section 5.5 of [RFC7234] with code "299"

o Reference: https://connect.ultipro.com/api-deprecation

Organization: Clearbit

o Description: Clearbit uses a custom HTTP header named "X-API-Warn"

o Reference: https://blog.clearbit.com/dealing-with-deprecation/

Organization: PayPal

o Description: PayPal uses a custom HTTP header named "PayPal-Deprecated"

o Reference: https://github.com/paypal/api-standards/blob/master/api-style-guide.md#runtime
9. Security Considerations

The Deprecation header field SHOULD be treated as a hint, meaning that the resource is indicating (and not guaranteeing with certainty) that it is deprecated. Applications consuming the resource SHOULD check the resource documentation to verify authenticity and accuracy. Resource documentation SHOULD provide additional information about the deprecation including recommendation(s) for replacement.

In cases, where the Deprecation header field value is a date in future, it can lead to information that otherwise might not be available. Therefore, applications consuming the resource SHOULD verify the resource documentation and if possible, consult the resource developer to discuss potential impact due to deprecation and plan for possible transition to recommended resource.

In cases where "Link" header is used to provide more documentation and/or recommendation for replacement, one should assume that the content of the "Link" header field may not be secure, private or integrity-guaranteed, and due caution should be exercised when using it. Applications consuming the resource SHOULD check the referred resource documentation to verify authenticity and accuracy.

The suggested "Link" header fields make extensive use of IRIs and URIs. See [RFC3987] for security considerations relating to IRIs. See [RFC3986] for security considerations relating to URIs. See [RFC7230] for security considerations relating to HTTP headers.

Applications that take advantage of typed links should consider the attack vectors opened by automatically following, trusting, or otherwise using links gathered from the HTTP headers. In particular, Link headers that use the "successor-version", "latest-version" or "alternate" relation types should be treated with due caution. See [RFC5829] for security considerations relating to these link relation types.

10. Examples

The first example shows a deprecation header field without date information:

Deprecation: true

The second example shows a deprecation header with date information and a link to the successor version:

Deprecation: Sun, 11 Nov 2018 23:59:59 GMT
Link: <https://api.example.com/v2/customers>; rel="successor-version"
The third example shows a deprecation header field with links for the successor version and for the API’s deprecation policy. In addition, it shows the sunset date for the deprecated resource:

Deprecation: Sun, 11 Nov 2018 23:59:59 GMT
Link: <https://api.example.com/v2/customers>; rel="successor-version", <https://developer.example.com/deprecation>; rel="deprecation"
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Abstract

The HTTP Idempotency-Key request header field can be used to carry idempotency key in order to make non-idempotent HTTP methods such as POST or PATCH fault-tolerant.
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1. Introduction

Idempotence is the property of certain operations in mathematics and computer science whereby they can be applied multiple times without changing the result beyond the initial application. It does not matter if the operation is called only once, or 10s of times over. The result SHOULD be the same.

Idempotency is important in building a fault-tolerant HTTP API. An HTTP request method is considered idempotent if the intended effect on the server of multiple identical requests with that method is the same as the effect for a single such request. According to [RFC7231], HTTP methods OPTIONS, HEAD, GET, PUT and DELETE are idempotent while methods POST and PATCH are not.

Let’s say a client of an HTTP API wants to create (or update) a resource using a POST method. Since POST is NOT an idempotent method, calling it multiple times can result in duplication or wrong updates. Consider a scenario where the client sent a POST request to the server, but it got a timeout. Following questions arise: Is the resource actually created (or updated)? Did the timeout occur during sending of the request, or when receiving of the response? Can the client safely retry the request, or does it need to figure out what
happened in the first place? If POST had been an idempotent method, such questions may not arise. Client would safely retry a request until it actually gets a valid response from the server.

For many use cases of HTTP APIs, duplicated resources are a severe problem from a business perspective. For example, duplicate records for requests involving any kind of money transfer MUST NOT be allowed. In other cases, processing of duplicate webhook delivery is not expected.

1.1. Notational Conventions

{::boilerplate bcp14-tagged}

This specification uses the Augmented Backus-Naur Form (ABNF) notation of [RFC5234] and includes, by reference, the IMF-fixdate rule as defined in Section 7.1.1.1 of [RFC7231].

The term "resource" is to be interpreted as defined in Section 2 of [RFC7231], that is identified by an URI. The term "resource server" is to be interpreted as "origin server" as defined in Section 3 of [RFC7231].

2. The Idempotency-Key HTTP Request Header Field

An idempotency key is a unique value generated by the client which the resource server uses to recognize subsequent retries of the same request. The Idempotency-Key HTTP request header field carries this key.

2.1. Syntax

Idempotency-Key is an Item Structured Header [RFC8941]. Its value MUST be a String. Refer to Section 3.3.3 of [RFC8941] for ABNF of sf-string:

Idempotency-Key = sf-string

Clients MUST NOT include more than one Idempotency-Key header field in the same request.

The following example shows an idempotency key using UUID [RFC4122]:

Idempotency-Key: "8e03978e-40d5-43e8-bc93-6894a57f9324"
2.2. Uniqueness of Idempotency Key

The idempotency key that is supplied as part of every POST request MUST be unique and MUST NOT be reused with another request with a different request payload.

Uniqueness of the key MUST be defined by the resource owner and MUST be implemented by the clients of the resource server. It is RECOMMENDED that UUID [RFC4122] or a similar random identifier be used as an idempotency key.

2.3. Idempotency Key Validity and Expiry

The resource MAY enforce time based idempotency keys, thus, be able to purge or delete a key upon its expiry. The resource server SHOULD define such expiration policy and publish it in the documentation.

2.4. Idempotency Fingerprint

An idempotency fingerprint MAY be used in conjunction with an idempotency key to determine the uniqueness of a request. Such a fingerprint is generated from request payload data by the resource server. An idempotency fingerprint generation algorithm MAY use one of the following or similar approaches to create a fingerprint.

* Checksum of the entire request payload.
* Checksum of selected element(s) in the request payload.
* Field value match for each field in the request payload.
* Field value match for selected element(s) in the request payload.
* Request digest/signature.

2.5. Responsibilities

Client

Clients of HTTP API requiring idempotency, SHOULD understand the idempotency related requirements as published by the server and use appropriate algorithm to generate idempotency keys.

For each request, client SHOULD

* Send a unique idempotency key in the HTTP Idempotency-Key request header field.
Resource Server

Resource server MUST publish idempotency related specification. This specification MUST include expiration related policy if applicable. Server is responsible for managing the lifecycle of the idempotency key.

For each request, server SHOULD

* Identify idempotency key from the HTTP Idempotency-Key request header field.

* Generate idempotency fingerprint if required.

* Check for idempotency considering various scenarios including the ones described in section below.

2.6. Idempotency Enforcement Scenarios

* First time request (idempotency key and fingerprint has not been seen)

  The resource server SHOULD process the request normally and respond with an appropriate response and status code.

* Duplicate request (idempotency key and fingerprint has been seen)

  Retry

  The request was retried after the original request completed. The resource server SHOULD respond with the result of the previously completed operation, success or an error. See Error Scenarios for details on errors.

Concurrent Request

  The request was retried before the original request completed. The resource server MUST respond with a resource conflict error. See Error Scenarios for details.

2.7. Error Scenarios

If the Idempotency-Key request header is missing for a documented idempotent operation requiring this header, the resource server SHOULD reply with an HTTP 400 status code with body containing a link pointing to relevant documentation. Alternately, using the HTTP header Link, the client can be informed about the error as shown below.
HTTP/1.1 400 Bad Request
Link: <https://developer.example.com/idempotency>;
    rel="describedby"; type="text/html"

If there is an attempt to reuse an idempotency key with a different
request payload, the resource server SHOULD reply with a HTTP 422
status code with body containing a link pointing to relevant
documentation. The status code 422 is defined in Section 11.2 of
[ RFC4918 ]. The server can also inform the client by using the HTTP
header Link as shown below.

HTTP/1.1 422 Unprocessable Entity
Link: <https://developer.example.com/idempotency>;
    rel="describedby"; type="text/html"

If the request is retried, while the original request is still being
processed, the resource server SHOULD reply with an HTTP 409 status
code with body containing a link or the HTTP header Link pointing to
the relevant documentation.

HTTP/1.1 409 Conflict
Link: <https://developer.example.com/idempotency>;
    rel="describedby"; type="text/html"

Error scenarios above describe the status of failed idempotent
requests after the resource server processes them. Clients MUST
correct the requests (with the exception of 409 where no correction
is required) before performing a retry operation, or the the resource
server MUST fail the request and return one of the above errors.

For other 4xx/5xx errors, such as 401, 403, 500, 502, 503, 504, 429,
or any other HTTP error code that is not listed here, the client
SHOULD act appropriately by following the resource server’s
documentation.

3. IANA Considerations

3.1. The Idempotency-Key HTTP Request Header Field

The Idempotency-Key field name should be added to the "Hypertext
Transfer Protocol (HTTP) Field Name Registry".

Field Name: Idempotency-Key

Status: permanent

Specification document: This specification, Section 2
4. Implementation Status

Note to RFC Editor: Please remove this section before publication.

This section records the status of known implementations of the protocol defined by this specification at the time of posting of this Internet-Draft, and is based on a proposal described in [RFC7942]. The description of implementations in this section is intended to assist the IETF in its decision processes in progressing drafts to RFCs. Please note that the listing of any individual implementation here does not imply endorsement by the IETF. Furthermore, no effort has been spent to verify the information presented here that was supplied by IETF contributors. This is not intended as, and must not be construed to be, a catalog of available implementations or their features. Readers are advised to note that other implementations may exist.

According to RFC 7942, "this will allow reviewers and working groups to assign due consideration to documents that have the benefit of running code, which may serve as evidence of valuable experimentation and feedback that have made the implemented protocols more mature. It is up to the individual working groups to use this information as they see fit".

Organization: Stripe

* Description: Stripe uses custom HTTP header named Idempotency-Key

* Reference: https://stripe.com/docs/idempotency

Organization: Adyen

* Description: Adyen uses custom HTTP header named Idempotency-Key

* Reference: https://docs.adyen.com/development-resources/api-idempotency/

Organization: Dwolla

* Description: Dwolla uses custom HTTP header named Idempotency-Key

* Reference: https://docs.dwolla.com/

Organization: Interledger

* Description: Interledger uses custom HTTP header named Idempotency-Key
* Reference: https://github.com/interledger/

Organization: WorldPay

* Description: WorldPay uses custom HTTP header named Idempotency-Key

* Reference: https://developer.worldpay.com/docs/wpg/idempotency

Organization: Yandex

* Description: Yandex uses custom HTTP header named Idempotency-Key

* Reference: https://cloud.yandex.com/docs/api-design-guide/concepts/idempotency

Organization: http4s.org

* Description: Http4s is a minimal, idiomatic Scala interface for HTTP services.

* Reference: https://github.com/http4s/http4s

Organization: Finastra

* Description: Finastra uses custom HTTP header named Idempotency-Key

* Reference: https://developer.fusionfabric.cloud/

Organization: Datatrans

* Description: Datatrans focuses on the technical processing of payments, including hosting smart payment forms and correctly routing payment information.

* Reference: https://docs.datatrans.ch/docs/api-endpoints

4.1. Implementing the Concept

This is a list of implementations that implement the general concept, but do so using different mechanisms:

Organization: Django

* Description: Django uses custom HTTP header named HTTP_IDEMPOTENCY_KEY
Twilio

* Description: Twilio uses custom HTTP header named I-Twilio-Idempotency-Token in webhooks


PayPal

* Description: PayPal uses custom HTTP header named PayPal-Request-Id


RazorPay

* Description: RazorPay uses custom HTTP header named X-Payout-Idempotency

* Reference: https://razorpay.com/docs/razorpayx/api/idempotency/

OpenBanking

* Description: OpenBanking uses custom HTTP header called x-idempotency-key


Square

* Description: To make an idempotent API call, Square recommends adding a property named idempotency_key with a unique value in the request body.


Google Standard Payments

* Description: Google Standard Payments API uses a property named requestId in request body in order to provider idempotency in various use cases.
Organization: BBVA

* Description: BBVA Open Platform uses custom HTTP header called X-Unique-Transaction-ID

* Reference: https://bbvaopenplatform.com/apiReference/APIbasics/content/x-unique-transaction-id

Organization: WebEngage

* Description: WebEngage uses custom HTTP header called x-request-id to identify webhook POST requests uniquely to achieve events idempotency.

* Reference: https://docs.webengage.com/docs/webhooks

5. Security Considerations

This section is meant to inform developers, information providers, and users of known security concerns specific to the idempotency keys.

Resource servers that do not implement strong idempotency keys, such as UUIDs, or have appropriate controls to validate the idempotency keys, could be victim to various forms of security attacks from malicious clients:

* Injection attacks—When the resource server does not validate the idempotency key in the client request and performs an idempotent cache lookup, there can be security attacks (primarily in the form of injection), compromising the server.

* Data leaks—When an idempotency implementation allows low entropy keys, attackers MAY determine other keys and use them to fetch existing idempotent cache entries, belonging to other clients.

To prevent such situations, the specification recommends the following best practices for idempotency key implementation in the resource server:

* Establish a fixed format for the idempotency key and publish the key’s specification.
* Always validate the key as per its published specification before processing any request.

* On the resource server, implement a unique composite key as the idempotent cache lookup key. For example, a composite key MAY be implemented by combining the idempotency key sent by the client with other client specific attributes known only to the resource server.

6. Examples

The first example shows an idempotency-key header field with key value using UUID version 4 scheme:

Idempotency-Key: "8e03978e-40d5-43e8-bc93-6894a57f9324"

Second example shows an idempotency-key header field with key value using some random string generator:

Idempotency-Key: "clkyoesmbgybucifusbbtdsbohtyuuwz"

7. References

7.1. Normative References


7.2. Informative References


Appendix A. Imported ABNF

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

The rules below are defined in [RFC7230]:

obs-text = <obs-text, see [RFC7230], Section 3.2.6>
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1. Introduction

Resources on the Web often use typed Web Links [RFC8288], either embedded in resource representations, for example using the <link> element for HTML documents, or conveyed in the HTTP "Link" header field for documents of any media type. In some cases, however, providing links in this manner is impractical or impossible and delivering a set of links as a stand-alone document is preferable.

Therefore, this specification defines two formats for representing sets of Web Links and their attributes as stand-alone documents. One serializes links in the same format as used in the HTTP Link header field, and the other serializes links in JSON. It also defines associated media types to represent sets of links, and the "linkset" relation type that supports discovery of any resource that conveys a set of links as a stand-alone document.

2. 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.

This specification uses the terms "link context" and "link target" in the same manner as [RFC8288].

In the examples provided in this document, links in the HTTP "Link" header field are shown on separate lines in order to improve readability. Note, however, that as per Section 5.5 of [I-D.ietf-httpbis-semantics], line breaks are deprecated in values for HTTP fields; only whitespaces and tabs are supported as separators.

3. Use Cases and Motivation

The following sections describe use cases in which providing links by means of a standalone document instead of in an HTTP "Link" header field or as links embedded in the resource representation is advantageous or necessary.
For all scenarios, links could be provided by means of a stand-alone document that is formatted according to the JSON-based serialization, the serialization aligned with the HTTP "Link" field format, or both. The former serialization is motivated by the widespread use of JSON and related tools, which suggests that handling sets of links expressed as JSON documents should be attractive to developers. The latter serialization is provided for compatibility with the existing serialization used in the HTTP "Link" field and to allow reuse of tools created to handle it.

It is important to keep in mind that when providing links by means of a standalone representation, other links can still be provided using other approaches, i.e. it is possible to combine various mechanisms to convey links.

3.1. Third-Party Links

In some cases it is useful that links pertaining to a resource are provided by a server other than the one that hosts the resource. For example, this allows:

* Providing links in which the resource is involved not just as link context but also as link target, with a different resource being the link context.

* Providing links pertaining to the resource that the server hosting that resource is not aware of.

* External management of links pertaining to the resource in a special-purpose link management service.

In such cases, links pertaining to a resource can be provided by another, specific resource. That specific resource may be managed by the same or by another custodian as the resource to which the links pertain. For clients intent on consuming links provided in that manner, it would be beneficial if the following conditions were met:

* Links are provided in a document that uses a well-defined media type.

* The resource to which the provided links pertain is able to link to the resource that provides these links using a well-known link relation type.

These requirements are addressed in this specification through the definition of two media types and a link relation type, respectively.
3.2. Challenges Writing to HTTP Link Header Field

In some cases, it is not straightforward to write links to the HTTP "Link" header field from an application. This can, for example, be the case because not all required link information is available to the application or because the application does not have the capability to directly write HTTP fields. In such cases, providing links by means of a standalone document can be a solution. Making the resource that provides these links discoverable can be achieved by means of a typed link.

3.3. Large Number of Links

When conveying links in an HTTP "Link" header field, it is possible for the size of the HTTP response fields to become unpredictable. This can be the case when links are determined dynamically in a manner dependent on a range of contextual factors. It is possible to statically configure a web server to correctly handle large HTTP response fields by specifying an upper bound for their size. But when the number of links is unpredictable, estimating a reliable upper bound is challenging.

Section 15 of HTTP [I-D.ietf-httpbis-semantics] defines error codes related to excess communication by the user agent ("413 Request Entity Too Large" and "414 Request-URI Too Long"), but no specific error codes are defined to indicate that response field content exceeds the upper bound that can be handled by the server and thus has been truncated. As a result, applications take counter measures aimed at controlling the size of the HTTP "Link" header field, for example by limiting the links they provide to those with select relation types, thereby limiting the value of the HTTP "Link" header field to clients. Providing links by means of a standalone document overcomes challenges related to the unpredictable (to the web server implementation) nature of the size of HTTP "Link" header fields.

4. Document Formats for Sets of Links

This section specifies two document formats to convey a set of links. Both are based on the abstract model specified in Section 2 of Web Linking [RFC8288] that defines a link as consisting of a "link context", a "link relation type", a "link target", and optional "target attributes":

* The format defined in Section 4.1 is nearly identical to the field value of the HTTP "Link" header field as specified in Section 3 of [RFC8288].

* The format defined in Section 4.2 is expressed in JSON [RFC8259].
Links provided in the HTTP Link header are intended to be used in the context of an HTTP interaction and contextual information that is available during an interaction is used to correctly interpret them. Links provided in link sets, however, can be re-used outside of an HTTP interaction, when no such contextual information is available. As a result, implementers of link sets should strive to make them self-contained by adhering to the following recommendations.

For links provided in the HTTP Link header that have no anchor or that use relative references, the URI of the resource that delivers the links provides the contextual information that is needed for their correct interpretation. In order to support use cases where link set documents are re-used outside the context of an HTTP interaction, it is RECOMMENDED to make them self-contained by adhering to the following guidelines:

* For every link provided in the set of links, explicitly provide the link context using the "anchor" attribute.

* For link context ("anchor" attribute) and link target ("href" attribute), use URI references that are not relative references (as defined in Section 4.1 of [RFC3986]).

If these recommendations are not followed, interpretation of links in link set documents will depend on which URI is used as context.

For a "title" attribute provided on a link in the HTTP Link header, the language in which the title is expressed is provided by the Content-Language header of the HTTP interaction with the resource that delivers the links. This does not apply to "title" attributes provided for links in link set documents because that would constrain all links in a link set to having a single title language and would not support determining title languages when a link set is used outside of an HTTP interaction. In order to support use cases where link set documents are re-used outside the context of an HTTP interaction, it is RECOMMENDED to make them self-contained by using the "title*" attribute instead of the "title" attribute because "title*" allows expressing the title language as part of its value by means of a language tag. With this regard, note that language tags are matched case-insensitively (see Section 2.1.1 of [RFC5646]). If this recommendation is not followed, accurately determining the language of titles provided on links in link set documents will not be possible.

Note also that Section 3.3 of [RFC8288] deprecates the "rev" construct that was provided by [RFC5988] as a means to express links with a directionality that is the inverse of direct links that use the "rel" construct. In both serializations for link sets defined
here, inverse links may be represented as direct links using the
"rel" construct and by switching the roles of the resources involved
in the link.

4.1. HTTP Link Document Format: application/linkset

This document format is nearly identical to the field value of the
HTTP "Link" header field as defined in Section 3 of [RFC8288], more
specifically by its ABNF [RFC5234] production rule for "Link" and
subsequent ones. It differs from the format for field values of the
HTTP "Link" header only in that not only spaces and horizontal tabs
are allowed as separators but also newline characters as a means to
improve readability for humans. The use of non-ASCII characters in
the field value of the HTTP "Link" Header field is not allowed, and
as such is also not allowed in "application/linkset" link sets.

The assigned media type for this format is "application/linkset".

When converting an "application/linkset" document to a field value
for the HTTP "Link" header, newline characters MUST be removed or
MUST be replaced by white space (SP) in order to comply with
Section 5.5 of [I-D.ietf-httpbis-semantics].

Implementers of "application/linkset" link sets should strive to make
them self-contained by following the recommendations regarding their
use outside the context of an HTTP interaction provided in Section 4.

It should be noted that the "application/linkset" format specified
here is different from the "application/link-format" format specified
in [RFC6690] in that the former fully matches the field value of the
HTTP "Link" header field as defined in Section 3 of [RFC8288],
whereas the latter introduces constraints on that definition to meet
requirements for Constrained RESTful Environments (CoRE).

4.2. JSON Document Format: application/linkset+json

This document format uses JSON [RFC8259] as the syntax to represent a
set of links. The set of links follows the abstract model defined by
Web Linking Section 2 of [RFC8288].

The assigned media type for this format is "application/
linkset+json".

In the interests of interoperability "application/linkset+json" link
sets MUST be encoded using UTF-8 as per Section 8.1 of [RFC8259].
Implementers of "application/linkset+json" link sets should strive to make them self-contained by following the recommendations regarding their use outside the context of an HTTP interaction provided in Section 4.

The "application/linkset+json" serialization allows for OPTIONAL support of a JSON-LD serialization. This can be achieved by adding an appropriate context to the "application/linkset+json" serialization using the approach described in Section 6.8. of [W3C.REC-json-ld-20140116]. Communities of practice can decide which context best meets their application needs. Appendix A shows an example of a possible context that, when added to a JSON serialization, allows it to be interpreted as Resource Description Framework (RDF) [W3C.REC-rdf11-concepts-20140225] data.

4.2.1. Set of Links

In the JSON representation of a set of links:

* A set of links is represented in JSON as an object which MUST contain "linkset" as its sole member.

* The value of the "linkset" member is an array in which a distinct JSON object - the "link context object" (see Section 4.2.2) - is used to represent links that have the same link context.

* Even if there is only one link context object, it MUST be wrapped in an array.

4.2.2. Link Context Object

In the JSON representation one or more links that have the same link context are represented by a JSON object, the link context object. A link context object adheres to the following rules:

* Each link context object MAY contain an "anchor" member with a value that represents the link context. If present, this value MUST be a URI reference and SHOULD NOT be a relative reference as defined in Section 4.1 of [RFC3986].

* For each distinct relation type that the link context has with link targets, a link context object MUST contain an additional member. The value of this member is an array in which a distinct JSON object - the "link target object" (see Section 4.2.3) - MUST be used for each link target for which the relationship with the link context (value of the encompassing anchor member) applies. The name of this member expresses the relation type of the link as follows:
- For registered relation types (Section 2.1.1 of [RFC8288]), the name of this member is the registered name of the relation type.

- For extension relation types (Section 2.1.2 of [RFC8288]), the name of this member is the URI that uniquely represents the relation type.

* Even if there is only one link target object it MUST be wrapped in an array.

4.2.3. Link Target Object

In the JSON representation a link target is represented by a JSON object, the link target object. A link target object adheres to the following rules:

* Each link target object MUST contain an "href" member with a value that represents the link target. This value MUST be a URI reference and SHOULD NOT be a relative reference as defined in Section 4.1 of [RFC3986]. Cases where the href member is present, but no value is provided for it (i.e. the resource providing the set of links is the target of the link in the link target object) MUST be handled by providing an "href" member with an empty string as its value ("href": "").

* In many cases, a link target is further qualified by target attributes. Various types of attributes exist and they are conveyed as additional members of the link target object as detailed in Section 4.2.4.

The following example of a JSON-serialized set of links represents one link with its core components: link context, link relation type, and link target.

```json
{ "linkset":
  [ 
    { "anchor": "https://example.net/bar",
      "next": [ 
        {"href": "https://example.com/foo"}
      ]
    ]
  ]
}
```

Figure 1
The following example of a JSON-serialized set of links represents two links that share link context and relation type but have different link targets.

```json
{ "linkset":
  [  
    { "anchor": "https://example.net/bar",  
       "item": [ 
              {"href": "https://example.com/fool"},  
              {"href": "https://example.com/foo2"}  
          ]  
    }
  ]
}
```

Figure 2

The following example shows a set of links that represents two links, each with a different link context, link target, and relation type. One relation type is registered, the other is an extension relation type.

```json
{ "linkset":
  [  
    { "anchor": "https://example.net/bar",  
       "next": [  
              {"href": "https://example.com/fool"}  
          ]  
    },  
    { "anchor": "https://example.net/boo",  
       "https://example.com/relations/baz": [  
                          {"href": "https://example.com/foo2"}  
          ]  
    }  
  ]
}
```

Figure 3

4.2.4. Link Target Attributes

A link may be further qualified by target attributes as defined by Section 2 of Web Linking [RFC8288]. Three types of attributes exist:

* Serialisation-defined attributes described in Section 3.4.1 of Web Linking [RFC8288].
* Extension attributes defined and used by communities as allowed by Section 3.4.2 of [RFC8288].

* Internationalized versions of the "title" attribute defined by [RFC8288] and of extension attributes allowed by Section 3.4 of [RFC8288].

The handling of these different types of attributes is described in the sections below.

4.2.4.1. Target Attributes Defined by Web Linking

Section 3.4.1 of [RFC8288] defines the following target attributes that may be used to annotate links: "hreflang", "media", "title", "title*", and "type"; these target attributes follow different occurrence and value patterns. In the JSON representation, these attributes MUST be conveyed as additional members of the link target object as follows:

* "hreflang": The "hreflang" target attribute, defined as optional and repeatable by [RFC8288], MUST be represented by an "hreflang" member, and its value MUST be an array (even if there only is one value to be represented), and each value in that array MUST be a string - representing one value of the "hreflang" target attribute for a link - which follows the same model as in the [RFC8288] syntax.

* "media": The "media" target attribute, defined as optional and not repeatable by [RFC8288], MUST be represented by a "media" member in the link target object, and its value MUST be a string that follows the same model as in the [RFC8288] syntax.

* "type": The "type" target attribute, defined as optional and not repeatable by [RFC8288], MUST be represented by a "type" member in the link target object, and its value MUST be a string that follows the same model as in the [RFC8288] syntax.

* "title": The "title" target attribute, defined as optional and not repeatable by [RFC8288], MUST be represented by a "title" member in the link target object, and its value MUST be a JSON string.

* "title*": The "title*" target attribute, defined as optional and not repeatable by [RFC8288], is motivated by character encoding and language issues and follows the model defined in [RFC8187]. The details of the JSON representation that applies to title* are described in Section 4.2.4.2.
The following example illustrates how the repeatable "hreflang" and the not repeatable "type" target attributes are represented in a link target object.

```json
{ "linkset":
    [ { "anchor": "https://example.net/bar",
        "next": [ { "href": "https://example.com/foo",
                    "type": "text/html",
                    "hreflang": [ "en", "de" ]
                } ]
    } ]
}
```

Figure 4

4.2.4.2. Internationalized Target Attributes

In addition to the target attributes described in Section 4.2.4.1, Section 3.4 of [RFC8288] also supports attributes that follow the content model of [RFC8187]. In [RFC8288], these target attributes are recognizable by the use of a trailing asterisk in the attribute name, such as "title*". The content model of [RFC8187] uses a string-based microsyntax that represents the character encoding, an optional language tag, and the escaped attribute value encoded according to the specified character encoding.

The JSON serialization for these target attributes MUST be as follows:

* An internationalized target attribute is represented as a member of the link context object with the same name (including the *) as the attribute.

* The character encoding information as prescribed by [RFC8187] is not preserved; instead, the content of the internationalized attribute is represented as a JSON string.
The value of the internationalized target attribute is an array that contains one or more JSON objects. The name of one member of such JSON object is "value" and its value is the actual content (in its unescaped version) of the internationalized target attribute, i.e. the value of the attribute from which the encoding and language information are removed. The name of another, optional, member of such JSON object is "language" and its value is the language tag [RFC5646] for the language in which the attribute content is conveyed.

The following example illustrates how the "title*" target attribute defined by Section 3.4.1 of [RFC8288] is represented in a link target object.

```json
{
  "linkset":
  {
    "anchor": "https://example.net/bar",
    "next": [
      {
        "href": "https://example.com/foo",
        "type": "text/html",
        "hreflang": [ "en" , "de" ],
        "title": "Next chapter",
        "title": [{ "value": "nächstes Kapitel",
                    "language": "de" }]
      }
    ]
  }
}
```

Figure 5

The above example assumes that the German title contains an umlaut character (in the original syntax it would be encoded as title*=UTF-8’de’n%c3%a4chstes%20Kapitel), which gets encoded in its unescaped form in the JSON representation. Implementations MUST properly decode/encode internationalized target attributes that follow the model of [RFC8187] when transcoding between the "application/linkset" and the "application/linkset+json" formats.

4.2.4.3. Extension Target Attributes

Extension target attributes are attributes that are not defined by Section 3.4.1 of [RFC8288] (as listed in Section 4.2.4.1), but are nevertheless used to qualify links. They can be defined by communities in any way deemed necessary, and it is up to them to make sure their usage is understood by target applications. However, lacking standardization, there is no interoperable understanding of
these extension attributes. One important consequence is that their cardinality is unknown to generic applications. Therefore, in the JSON serialization, all extension target attributes are treated as repeatable.

The JSON serialization for these target attributes MUST be as follows:

* An extension target attribute is represented as a member of the link target object with the same name as the attribute, including the * if applicable.

* The value of an extension attribute MUST be represented by an array, even if there only is one value to be represented.

* If the extension target attribute does not have a name with a trailing asterisk, then each value in that array MUST be a JSON string that represents one value of the attribute.

* If the extension attribute has a name with a trailing asterisk (it follows the content model of [RFC8187]), then each value in that array MUST be a JSON object. The value of each such JSON object MUST be structured as described in Section 4.2.4.2.

The example shows a link target object with three extension target attributes. The value for each extension target attribute is an array. The two first are regular extension target attributes, with the first one ("foo") having only one value and the second one ("bar") having two. The last extension target attribute ("baz\*") follows the naming rule of [RFC8187] and therefore is encoded according to the serialization described in Section 4.2.4.2.

```json
{ "linkset":
  [ { "anchor": "https://example.net/bar",
      "next": [ { "href": "https://example.com/foo",
                 "type": "text/html",
                 "foo": [ "foovalue" ],
                 "bar": [ "barone", "bartwo" ],
                 "baz*": [ { "value": "bazvalue",
                               "language": "en" } ]
               } }
     ] }
}
```
4.2.5. JSON Extensibility

The Web linking model ([RFC8288]) provides for the use of extension target attributes as discussed in Section 4.2.4.3. The use of other forms of extensions is NOT RECOMMENDED. Limiting the JSON format in this way allows to unambiguously round trip between links provided in the HTTP "Link" header field, sets of links serialized according to the "application/linkset" format, and sets of links serialized according to the "application/linkset+json" format.

Cases may exist in which the use of extensions other than those of Section 4.2.4.3 may be useful. For example, when a link set publisher needs to include descriptive or technical metadata for internal consumption. In case such extensions are used they MUST NOT change the semantics of the JSON members defined in this specification. Agents that consume JSON linkset documents can safely ignore such extensions.

5. The "profile" parameter for media types to Represent Sets of Links

As a means to convey specific constraints or conventions (as per [RFC6906]) that apply to a link set document, the "profile" parameter MAY be used in conjunction with the media types "application/linkset" and "application/linkset+json" detailed in Section 4.1 and Section 4.2, respectively. For example, the parameter could be used to indicate that a link set uses a specific, limited set of link relation types.

The value of the "profile" parameter MUST be a non-empty list of space-separated URIs, each of which identifies specific constraints or conventions that apply to the link set document. When providing multiple profile URIs, care should be taken that the corresponding profiles are not conflicting. Profile URIs MAY be registered in the IANA Profile URI Registry in the manner specified by [RFC7284].

The presence of a "profile" parameter in conjunction with the "application/linkset" and "application/linkset+json" media types does not change the semantics of a link set. As such, clients with and without knowledge of profile URIs can use the same representation.

Section 7.4.2 shows an example of using the "profile" parameter in conjunction with the "application/linkset+json" media type.
6. The "linkset" Relation Type for Linking to a Set of Links

The target of a link with the "linkset" relation type provides a set of links, including links in which the resource that is the link context participates.

A link with the "linkset" relation type MAY be provided in the header field and/or the body of a resource’s representation. It may also be discovered by other means, such as through client-side information.

A resource MAY provide more than one link with a "linkset" relation type. Multiple such links can refer to the same set of links expressed using different media types, or to different sets of links, potentially provided by different third-party services.

The set of links provided by the resource that is the target of a "linkset" link may contain links in which the resource that is the context of the "linkset" link does not participate. User agents MUST process each link in the link set independently, including processing of link context and link target, and MAY ignore links from the link set in which the context of the "linkset" link does not participate.

A user agent that follows a "linkset" link and obtains links for which anchors and targets are expressed as relative references (as per Section 4.1 of [RFC3986]) MUST determine what the context is for these links; it SHOULD ignore links for which it is unable to unambiguously make that determination.

As a means to convey specific constraints or conventions (as per [RFC6906]) that apply to a link set document, the "profile" attribute MAY be used in conjunction with the "linkset" link relation type. For example, the attribute could be used to indicate that a link set uses a specific, limited set of link relation types. The value of the "profile" attribute MUST be a non-empty list of space-separated URIs, each of which identifies specific constraints or conventions that apply to the link set document. Profile URIs MAY be registered in the IANA Profile URI Registry in the manner specified by [RFC7284]. Section 7.4.1 shows an example of using the "profile" attribute on a link with the "linkset" relation type, making both the link set and the profile(s) to which it complies discoverable.
7. Examples

Section 7.1 and Section 7.2 show examples whereby a set of links is provided as "application/linkset" and "application/linkset+json" documents, respectively. Section 7.3 illustrates the use of the "linkset" link relation type to support discovery of sets of links and Section 7.4 shows how to convey profile information pertaining to a link set.

7.1. Set of Links Provided as application/linkset

Figure 7 shows a client issuing an HTTP GET request against resource <https://example.org/links/resource1>.

GET /links/resource1 HTTP/1.1
Host: example.org

Figure 7: Client HTTP GET request

Figure 8 shows the response to the GET request of Figure 7. The response contains a Content-Type header field specifying that the media type of the response is "application/linkset". A set of links, revealing authorship and versioning related to resource <https://example.org/resource1>, is provided in the response body. The HTTP "Link" header field indicates the availability of an alternate representation of the set of links using media type "application/linkset+json".
HTTP/1.1 200 OK
Date: Mon, 12 Aug 2019 10:35:51 GMT
Server: Apache-Coyote/1.1
Content-Length: 1023
Content-Type: application/linkset
Link: <https://example.org/links/resource1>
  ; rel="alternate"
  ; type="application/linkset+json"

<https://authors.example.net/johndoe>
  ; rel="author"
  ; type="application/rdf+xml"
  ; anchor="https://example.org/resource1",
<https://example.org/resource1?version=3>
  ; rel="latest-version"
  ; type="text/html"
  ; anchor="https://example.org/resource1",
<https://example.org/resource1?version=2>
  ; rel="predecessor-version"
  ; type="text/html"
  ; anchor="https://example.org/resource1?version=3",
<https://example.org/resource1?version=1>
  ; rel="predecessor-version"
  ; type="text/html"
  ; anchor="https://example.org/resource1?version=2",
<https://example.org/resource1?version=1>
  ; rel="memento"
  ; type="text/html"
  ; datetime="Thu, 13 Jun 2019 09:34:33 GMT"
  ; anchor="https://example.org/resource1",
<https://example.org/resource1?version=2>
  ; rel="memento"
  ; type="text/html"
  ; datetime="Sun, 21 Jul 2019 12:22:04 GMT"
  ; anchor="https://example.org/resource1",
<https://authors.example.net/alice>
  ; rel="author"
  ; anchor="https://example.org/resource1#comment=1"

Figure 8: Response to HTTP GET includes a set of links

7.2. Set of Links Provided as application/linkset+json

Figure 9 shows the client issuing an HTTP GET request against
<https://example.org/links/resource1>. In the request, the client
uses an "Accept" header field to indicate it prefers a response in
the "application/linkset+json" format.
GET links/resource1 HTTP/1.1
Host: example.org
Accept: application/linkset+json

Figure 9: Client HTTP GET request expressing preference for 
"application/ linkset+json" response

Figure 10 shows the response to the HTTP GET request of Figure 9. The set of links is serialized according to the media type 
"application/linkset+json".

HTTP/1.1 200 OK
Date: Mon, 12 Aug 2019 10:46:22 GMT
Server: Apache-Coyote/1.1
Content-Type: application/linkset+json
Link: <https://example.org/links/resource1>
    ; rel="alternate"
    ; type="application/linkset"
Content-Length: 1246

{ "linkset":
  [ 
    { "anchor": "https://example.org/resource1",
      "author": [ 
        { "href": "https://authors.example.net/johndoe",
          "type": "application/rdf+xml" 
        },
      ],
      "memento": [ 
        { "href": "https://example.org/resource1?version=1",
          "type": "text/html",
          "datetime": "Thu, 13 Jun 2019 09:34:33 GMT"
        },
        { "href": "https://example.org/resource1?version=2",
          "type": "text/html",
          "datetime": "Sun, 21 Jul 2019 12:22:04 GMT"
        }
      ],
      "latest-version": [ 
        { "href": "https://example.org/resource1?version=3",
          "type": "text/html"
        }
      ]
    },
    { "anchor": "https://example.org/resource1?version=3",
      "predecessor-version": [ 
        { "href": "https://example.org/resource1?version=2",
          "type": "text/html"
        }
      ]
    }
  ]}
Figure 10: Response to the client’s request for the set of links

7.3. Discovering a Link Set via the "linkset" Link Relation Type

Figure 11 shows a client issuing an HTTP HEAD request against resource <https://example.org/resource1>.

HEAD resource1 HTTP/1.1
Host: example.org

Figure 11: Client HTTP HEAD request

Figure 12 shows the response to the HEAD request of Figure 11. The response contains an HTTP "Link" header field with a link that has the "linkset" relation type. It indicates that a set of links is provided by resource <https://example.org/links/resource1>, which provides a representation with media type "application/linkset+json".

HTTP/1.1 200 OK
Date: Mon, 12 Aug 2019 10:45:54 GMT
Server: Apache-Coyote/1.1
Link: <https://example.org/links/resource1>
   ; rel="linkset"
   ; type="application/linkset+json"
Content-Length: 236
Content-Type: text/html;charset=utf-8

Figure 12: Response to HTTP HEAD request
7.4. Link Set Profiles

The examples in this section illustrate the use of the "profile" attribute for a link with the "linkset" link relation type and the "profile" attribute for a link set media type. The examples are inspired by the implementation of link sets by GS1 (the standards body behind many of the world's barcodes).

7.4.1. Using a "profile" Attribute with a "linkset" Link

Figure 13 shows a client issuing an HTTP HEAD request against trade item 09506000134352 at <https://id.gs1.org/01/9506000134352>.

    HEAD /01/9506000134352 HTTP/1.1
    Host: id.gs1.org

    Figure 13: Client HTTP HEAD request

Figure 14 shows the server's response to the request of Figure 13, including a "linkset" link with a "profile" attribute that has the Profile URI <https://www.gs1.org/voc/?show=linktypes> as its value. Dereferencing that URI yields a profile document that lists all the link relation types that a client can expect when requesting the link set made discoverable by the "linkset" link. The link relation types are presented in abbreviated form, e.g. <gs1:activityIdeas>, whereas the actual link relation type URIs are available as hyperlinks on the abbreviations, e.g. <https://www.gs1.org/voc/activityIdeas>. For posterity that profile document was saved in the Internet Archive at <https://web.archive.org/web/20210927160406/https://www.gs1.org/voc/?show=linktypes> on 27 September 2021.

    HTTP/1.1 307 Temporary Redirect
    Date: Mon, 27 Sep 2021 16:03:07 GMT
    Server: nginx
    Location: https://example.com/risotto-rice-with-mushrooms/

    Figure 14: Response to the client’s HEAD request including a "profile" attribute for the "linkset" link

7.4.2. Using a "profile" Parameter with a Link Set Media Type

Figure 15 shows a client issuing an HTTP HEAD request against the link set <https://id.gs1.org/01/9506000134352?linkType=all> that was discovered through the HTTP interactions shown in Section 7.4.1.
HEAD /01/9506000134352?linkType=all HTTP/1.1
Host: id.gs1.org

Figure 15: Client HTTP HEAD request

Figure 16 shows the server’s response to the request of Figure 15. Note the "profile" parameter for the application/linkset+json media type, which has as value the same Profile URI <https://www.gs1.org/voc/?show=linktypes> as was used in <xref target="Response_pr_at"/>

HTTP/1.1 200 OK
Date: Mon, 27 Sep 2021 16:03:33 GMT
Server: nginx
Content-Type: application/linkset+json;
    profile="https://www.gs1.org/voc/?show=linktypes"
Content-Length: 396

Figure 16: Response to the client’s HEAD request including a "profile" parameter for the "application/linkset+json" media type

7.4.3. Using a Link with a "profile" Link Relation Type

Note that the response Figure 16 from the link set resource is equivalent to the response shown in Figure 17, which leverages the "profile" link relation type defined in [RFC6906].

HTTP/1.1 200 OK
Date: Mon, 27 Sep 2021 16:03:33 GMT
Server: nginx
Content-Type: application/linkset+json
Link: https://www.gs1.org/voc/?show=linktypes; rel="profile"
Content-Length: 396

Figure 17: Response to the client’s HEAD request including a "profile" link

A link with a "profile" link relation type as shown in Figure 17 can also be conveyed in the link set document itself. This is illustrated by Figure 18. Following the recommendation that all links in a link set document should have an explicit anchor, such a link has the URI of the link set itself as anchor and the Profile URI as target. Multiple Profile URIs are handled by using multiple "href" members.
Figure 18: A Link Set that declares the profile it complies with using a "profile" link

8. IANA Considerations

8.1. Link Relation Type: linkset

The link relation type below should be registered by IANA in the Link Relation Type Registry as per Section 4.2 of Web Linking [RFC8288]:

Relation Name: linkset

Description: The link target of a link with the "linkset" relation type provides a set of links, including links in which the link context of the link participates.

Reference: [[ This document ]]

8.2. Media Type: application/linkset

The Internet media type application/linkset for a linkset encoded as described in Section 4.1 should be registered by IANA in the Media Type Registry as per [RFC6838].

Type name: application

Subtype name: linkset

Required parameters: N/A

Optional parameters: profile
Encoding considerations: Linksets are encoded according to the definition of [RFC8288]. The encoding of [RFC8288] is based on the general encoding rules of [I-D.ietf-httpbis-semantics], with the addition of allowing indicating character encoding and language for specific parameters as defined by [RFC8187].

Security considerations: The security considerations of [[ This document ]] apply.

Interoperability considerations: N/A

Published specification: [[ This document ]]

Applications that use this media type: This media type is not specific to any application, as it can be used by any application that wants to interchange web links.

Additional information:

  Magic number(s): N/A
  File extension(s): This media type does not propose a specific extension.
  Macintosh file type code(s): TEXT

Person & email address to contact for further information: Erik Wilde <erik.wilde@dret.net>

Intended usage: COMMON

Restrictions on usage: none

Author: Erik Wilde <erik.wilde@dret.net>

Change controller: IETF

8.3. Media Type: application/linkset+json

The Internet media type application/linkset+json for a linkset encoded as described in Section 4.2 should be registered by IANA in the Media Type Registry as per [RFC6838].

  Type name: application
  Subtype name: linkset+json
  Required parameters: N/A
Optional parameters: profile

Encoding considerations: The encoding considerations of [RFC8259] apply

Security considerations: The security considerations of [[ This document ]] apply.

Interoperability considerations: The interoperability considerations of [RFC8259] apply.

Published specification: [[ This document ]]

Applications that use this media type: This media type is not specific to any application, as it can be used by any application that wants to interchange web links.

Additional information:

  Magic number(s): N/A

  File extension(s): JSON documents often use ".json" as the file extension, and this media type does not propose a specific extension other than this generic one.

  Macintosh file type code(s): TEXT

Person & email address to contact for further information: Erik Wilde <erik.wilde@dret.net>

Intended usage: COMMON

Restrictions on usage: none

Author: Erik Wilde <erik.wilde@dret.net>

Change controller: IETF

9. Security Considerations

The security considerations of Section 7 of [RFC3986] apply, as well as those of Web Linking [RFC8288] as long as the latter are not specifically discussing the risks of exposing information in HTTP header fields.

In general, links may cause information leakage when they expose information (such as URIs) that can be sensitive or private. Links may expose "hidden URIs" that are not supposed to be openly shared,
and may not be sufficiently protected. Ideally, none of the URIs exposed in links should be supposed to be "hidden"; instead, if these URIs are supposed to be limited to certain users, then technical measures should be put in place so that accidentally exposing them does not cause any harm.

For the specific mechanisms defined in this specification, two security considerations should be taken into account:

* The Web Linking model always has an "implicit context", which is the resource of the HTTP interaction. This original context can be lost or can change when self-contained link representations are moved. Changing the context can change the interpretation of links when they have no explicit anchor, or when they use relative URIs. Applications may choose to ignore links that have no explicit anchor or that use relative URIs when these are exchanged in stand-alone resources.

* The model introduced in this specification supports "3rd party links", where one party can provide links that have another party’s resource as an anchor. Depending on the link semantics and the application context, it is important to verify that there is sufficient trust in that 3rd party to allow it to provide these links. Applications may choose to treat 3rd party links differently than cases where a resource and the links for that resource are provided by the same party.

10. Normative References


11. Informative References

[W3C.REC-json-ld-20140116]


[I-D.ietf-httpbis-semantics]

[W3C.REC-rdf11-concepts-20140225]

Appendix A. JSON-LD Context

A set of links rendered according to the JSON serialization defined in Section 4.2 can be interpreted as RDF triples by adding a JSON-LD context [W3C.REC-json-ld-20140116] that maps the JSON keys to corresponding Linked Data terms. And, as per [W3C.REC-json-ld-20140116] section 6.8 (https://www.w3.org/TR/2014/REC-json-ld-20140116/#interpreting-json-as-json-ld), when delivering a link set that is rendered according to the "application/linkset+json" media type to a user agent, a server can convey the availability of such a JSON-LD context by using a link with the relation type "http://www.w3.org/ns/json-ld#context" in the HTTP "Link" header.

Figure 19 shows the response to an HTTP GET against the URI of a link set resource and illustrates this approach to support discovery of a JSON-LD Context. The example is inspired by the GS1 implementation and shows a link set that uses relation types from the GS1 vocabulary at <https://www.gs1.org/voc/> that are expressed as HTTP URIs.

HTTP/1.1 200 OK
Date: Mon, 11 Oct 2021 10:48:22 GMT
Server: Apache-Coyote/1.1
Content-Type: application/linkset+json
Link: <https://example.org/contexts/linkset.jsonld>
     ; rel="http://www.w3.org/ns/json-ld#context"
"linkset": [
  {
    "anchor": "https://id.gs1.org/01/09506000149301",
    "https://gs1.org/voc/pip": [
      {
        "href": "https://example.com/en/defaultPage",
        "hreflang": ["en"],
        "type": "text/html",
        "title": "Product information"
      },
      {
        "href": "https://example.com/fr/defaultPage",
        "hreflang": ["fr"],
        "title": "Information produit"
      }
    ],
    "https://gs1.org/voc/whatsInTheBox": [
      {
        "hreflang": ["en"],
        "title": "What’s in the box?"
      },
      {
        "href": "https://example.com/fr/packContents/FR",
        "hreflang": ["fr"],
        "title": "Qu’y a-t-il dans la boîte?"
      },
      {
        "href": "https://example.com/fr/packContents/CH",
        "hreflang": ["fr"],
        "title": "Qu’y a-t-il dans la boîte?"
      }
    ],
    "https://gs1.org/voc/relatedVideo": [
      
    ]
  }
]
Figure 19: Using a typed link to support discovery of a JSON-LD Context for a Set of Links

In order to obtain the JSON-LD Context conveyed by the server, the user agent issues an HTTP GET against the link target of the link with the "http://www.w3.org/ns/json-ld#context" relation type. The response to this GET is shown in Figure 20. This particular JSON-LD context maps "application/linkset+json" representations of link sets to Dublin Core Terms [DCMI-TERMS]. Note that the "linkset" entry in the JSON-LD context is introduced to support links with the "linkset" relation type in link sets.
HTTP/1.1 200 OK
Content-Type: application/ld+json
Content-Length: 658
{
  "@context": [
    {
      "@version": 1.1,
      "@vocab": "https://gs1.org/voc/",
      "anchor": "@id",
      "href": "@id",
      "linkset": {
        "@id": "@graph",
        "@context": {
          "linkset": "linkset"
        }
      },
      "title": {
        "@id": "http://purl.org/dc/terms/title"
      },
      "title*": {
        "@id": "http://purl.org/dc/terms/title"
      },
      "type": {
        "@id": "http://purl.org/dc/terms/format"
      }
    },
    {
      "language": "@language",
      "value": "@value",
      "hreflang": {
        "@id": "http://purl.org/dc/terms/language",
        "@container": "@set"
      }
    }
  ]
}

Figure 20: JSON-LD Context mapping to Dublin Core Terms

Applying the JSON-LD context of Figure 20 to the link set of Figure 19 allows transforming the "application/linkset+json" link set to an RDF link set. Figure 21 shows the latter represented by means of the "text/turtle" RDF serialization.
<https://id.gs1.org/01/09506000149301>
  <https://gs1.org/voc/whatsInTheBox>
<https://video.example>
  <http://purl.org/dc/terms/language>
  "en" .
<https://video.example>
  <http://purl.org/dc/terms/language>
  "fr" .
<https://video.example>
  <http://purl.org/dc/terms/title>
  "See it in action!"@en .
<https://video.example>
  <http://purl.org/dc/terms/title>
  "Voyez-le en action!"@fr .

Figure 21: RDF serialization of the link set resulting from applying the JSON-LD context

Appendix B. Implementation Status

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

This section records the status of known implementations of the protocol defined by this specification at the time of posting of this Internet-Draft, and is based on a proposal described in RFC 7942 [RFC7942]. The description of implementations in this section is intended to assist the IETF in its decision processes in progressing drafts to RFCs. Please note that the listing of any individual implementation here does not imply endorsement by the IETF. Furthermore, no effort has been spent to verify the information presented here that was supplied by IETF contributors. This is not intended as, and must not be construed to be, a catalog of available implementations or their features. Readers are advised to note that other implementations may exist.

According to RFC 7942, "this will allow reviewers and working groups to assign due consideration to documents that have the benefit of running code, which may serve as evidence of valuable experimentation and feedback that have made the implemented protocols more mature. It is up to the individual working groups to use this information as they see fit".
B.1. GS1

GS1 is a provider of identifiers, most famously seen in EAN/UPC barcodes for retail and healthcare products, and manages an ecology of services and standards to leverage them at a global scale. GS1 has indicated that it will fully implement this "linkset" specification as a means to allow requesting and representing links pertaining to products, shipments, assets and locations. The current GS1 Digital Link specification makes an informative reference to version 03 of the "linkset" I-D, mentions the formal adoption of that I-D by the IETF HTTPAPI Working Group, and indicates it being on track to achieve RFC status. The GS1 Digital Link specification adopts the JSON format specified by the I-D and mentions future plans to also support the Link header format as well as their respective media types, neither of which have changed since version 03.

B.2. FAIR Signposting Profile

The FAIR Signposting Profile is a community specification aimed at improving machine navigation of scholarly objects on the web through the use of typed web links pointing at e.g. web resources that are part of a specific object, persistent identifiers for the object and its authors, license information pertaining to the object. The specification encourages the use of Linksets and initial implementations are ongoing, for example, for the open source Dataverse data repository platform that was initiated by Harvard University and is meanwhile used by research institutions, worldwide.

B.3. Open Journal Systems (OJS)

Open Journal Systems (OJS) is an open-source software for the management of peer-reviewed academic journals, and is created by the Public Knowledge Project (PKP), released under the GNU General Public License. Open Journal Systems (OJS) is a journal management and publishing system that has been developed by PKP through its federally funded efforts to expand and improve access to research.

The OJS platform has implemented "linkset" support as an alternative way to provide links when there are more than a configured limit (they consider using about 10 as a good default, for testing purpose it is currently set to 8).
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Abstract

This document defines the RateLimit-Limit, RateLimit-Remaining, RateLimit-Reset and RateLimit-Policy fields for HTTP, thus allowing servers to publish current service limits and clients to shape their request policy and avoid being throttled out.
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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 7 January 2023.
1. Introduction

The widespread of HTTP as a distributed computation protocol requires an explicit way of communicating service status and usage quotas.

This was partially addressed by the "Retry-After" header field defined in [HTTP] to be returned in 429 (Too Many Request) (see [STATUS429]) or 503 (Service Unavailable) responses.

Widely deployed quota mechanisms limit the number of acceptable requests in a given time window, e.g. 10 requests per second; currently, there is no standard way to communicate service quotas so that the client can throttle its requests and prevent 4xx or 5xx responses. See Appendix A for further information on the current usage of rate limiting in HTTP.

This document defines syntax and semantics for the following fields:

* RateLimit-Limit: containing the requests quota in the time window;

* RateLimit-Remaining: containing the remaining requests quota in the current window;
Internet-Draft          RateLimit Fields for HTTP              July 2022

* RateLimit-Reset: containing the time remaining in the current
  window, specified in seconds;

* RateLimit-Policy: containing the quota policy information.

The behavior of the RateLimit-Reset field is compatible with the
delay-seconds notation of Retry-After.

The fields definition allows to describe complex policies, including
the ones using multiple and variable time windows and dynamic quotas,
or implementing concurrency limits.

1.1. Goals

The goals of the RateLimit fields are:

Interoperability: Standardization of the names and semantics of
  rate-limit headers to ease their enforcement and adoption;

Resiliency: Improve resiliency of HTTP infrastructure by providing
  clients with information useful to throttle their requests and
  prevent 4xx or 5xx responses;

Documentation: Simplify API documentation by eliminating the need to
  include detailed quota limits and related fields in API
  documentation.

The following features are out of the scope of this document:

Authorization: RateLimit fields are not meant to support
  authorization or other kinds of access controls.

Throttling scope: This specification does not cover the throttling
  scope, that may be the given resource-target, its parent path or
  the whole Origin (see Section 7 of [WEB-ORIGIN]). This can be
  addressed using extensibility mechanisms such as the parameter
  registry Section 8.1.

Response status code: RateLimit fields may be returned in both
  successful (see Section 15.3 of [HTTP]) and non-successful
  responses. This specification does not cover whether non
  Successful responses count on quota usage, nor it mandates any
  correlation between the RateLimit values and the returned status
  code.

Throttling policy: This specification does not mandate a specific
  throttling policy. The values published in the fields, including
  the window size, can be statically or dynamically evaluated.
Service Level Agreement: Conveyed quota hints do not imply any service guarantee. Server is free to throttle respectful clients under certain circumstances.

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.

This document uses the Augmented BNF defined in [RFC5234] and updated by [RFC7405] along with the "#rule" extension defined in Section 5.6.1 of [HTTP].

The term Origin is to be interpreted as described in Section 7 of [WEB-ORIGIN].

This document uses the following terminology from Section 3 of [STRUCTURED-FIELDS] to specify syntax and parsing: List, Item and Integer together with the concept of bare item.

The fields defined in this document are collectively named "RateLimit fields".

2. Expressing rate-limit policies

2.1. Time window

Rate limit policies limit the number of acceptable requests in a given time interval.

The "time-window" is a non-negative Integer value expressing such interval in seconds compatible with the "delay-seconds" rule defined in Section 10.2.3 of [HTTP].

Subsecond precision is not supported.

2.2. Service limit and quota units

The "service-limit" is a value associated to the maximum number of requests that the server is willing to accept from one or more clients on a given basis (originating IP, authenticated user, geographical, ..) during a time window (Section 2.1).

The service-limit is a non-negative Integer expressed in "quota-units".
The service-limit SHOULD match the maximum number of acceptable requests.

The service-limit MAY differ from the total number of acceptable requests when weight mechanisms, bursts, or other server policies are implemented.

If the service-limit does not match the maximum number of acceptable requests the relation with that SHOULD be communicated out-of-band.

Example: A server could

* count once requests like /books/{id}

* count twice search requests like /books?author=WuMing

so that we have the following counters

GET /books/123 ; service-limit=4, remaining: 3, status=200
GET /books?author=WuMing ; service-limit=4, remaining: 1, status=200
GET /books?author=Eco ; service-limit=4, remaining: 0, status=429

2.3. Quota policy

A "quota-policy" describes a quota policy in terms of quota-units (Section 2.2) and time-window (Section 2.1). Its value is an Item where the associated bare item is a service-limit (Section 2.2) and parameters are supported.

The following parameters are defined:

w: The REQUIRED "w" parameter value conveys a "time-window" value as defined in Section 2.1.

Other parameters are allowed and can be regarded as comments. They ought to be registered within the "Hypertext Transfer Protocol (HTTP) RateLimit Parameters Registry", as described in Section 8.1.

An example policy of 100 quota-units per minute.

100;w=60

The definition of a quota-policy does not imply any specific distribution of quota-units over time. Such service specific details can be conveyed as parameters.

Two policy examples containing further details via custom parameters
100;w=60;comment="fixed window"
12;w=1;burst=1000;policy="leaky bucket"

To avoid clashes, implementers SHOULD prefix unregistered parameters with an x-<vendor> identifier, e.g. x-acme-policy, x-acme-burst. While it is useful to define a clear syntax and semantics even for custom parameters, it is important to note that user agents are not required to process quota policy information.

3. Providing RateLimit fields

A server uses the RateLimit fields to communicate its quota policies according to the following rules:

* RateLimit-Limit and RateLimit-Reset fields are REQUIRED;
* RateLimit-Remaining field is RECOMMENDED.

The returned values refer to the metrics used to evaluate if the current request respects the quota policy and MAY not apply to subsequent requests.

Example: a successful response with the following fields

    RateLimit-Limit: 10
    RateLimit-Remaining: 1
    RateLimit-Reset: 7

does not guarantee that the next request will be successful. Server metrics may be subject to other conditions like the one shown in the example from Section 2.2.

A server MAY return RateLimit fields independently of the response status code. This includes throttled responses.

This document does not mandate any correlation between the RateLimit field values and the returned status code.

Servers should be careful in returning RateLimit fields in redirection responses (e.g. 3xx status codes) because a low RateLimit-Remaining field value could prevent the client from issuing requests. For example, given the RateLimit fields below, a client could decide to wait 10 seconds before following the "Location" header field (see Section 10.2.2 of [HTTP]), because the RateLimit-Remaining field value is 0.
HTTP/1.1 301 Moved Permanently
Location: /foo/123
RateLimit-Remaining: 0
RateLimit-Limit: 10
RateLimit-Reset: 10

If a response contains both the Retry-After and the RateLimit-Reset fields, the RateLimit-Reset field value SHOULD reference the same point in time as the Retry-After field value.

When using a policy involving more than one time-window, the server MUST reply with the RateLimit fields related to the time window with the lower RateLimit-Remaining field values.

A service returning RateLimit fields MUST NOT convey values exposing an unwanted volume of requests and SHOULD implement mechanisms to cap the ratio between RateLimit-Remaining and RateLimit-Reset field values (see Section 6.5); this is especially important when quota-policies use a large time-window.

Under certain conditions, a server MAY artificially lower RateLimit field values between subsequent requests, e.g. to respond to Denial of Service attacks or in case of resource saturation.

Servers usually establish whether the request is in-quota before creating a response, so the RateLimit field values should be already available in that moment. Nonetheless servers MAY decide to send the RateLimit fields in a trailer section.

3.1. Performance considerations

Servers are not required to return RateLimit fields in every response, and clients need to take this into account. For example, an implementer concerned with performance might provide RateLimit fields only when a given quota is going to expire.

Implementers concerned with response fields’ size, might take into account their ratio with respect to the content length, or use header-compression HTTP features such as [HPACK].

4. Receiving RateLimit fields

A client MUST validate the values received in the RateLimit fields before using them and check if there are significant discrepancies with the expected ones. This includes a RateLimit-Reset field moment too far in the future (e.g. similarly to receiving "Retry-after: 1000000") or a service-limit too high.
A client receiving RateLimit fields MUST NOT assume that subsequent responses contain the same RateLimit fields, or any RateLimit fields at all.

Malformed RateLimit fields MAY be ignored.

A client SHOULD NOT exceed the quota-units conveyed by the RateLimit-Remaining field before the time-window expressed in RateLimit-Reset field.

A client MAY still probe the server if the RateLimit-Reset field is considered too high.

The value of RateLimit-Reset field is generated at response time: a client aware of a significant network latency MAY behave accordingly and use other information (e.g. the "Date" response header field, or otherwise gathered metrics) to better estimate the RateLimit-Reset field moment intended by the server.

The details provided in RateLimit-Policy field are informative and MAY be ignored.

If a response contains both the RateLimit-Reset and Retry-After fields, the Retry-After field MUST take precedence and the RateLimit-Reset field MAY be ignored.

This specification does not mandate a specific throttling behavior and implementers can adopt their preferred policies, including:

* slowing down or preemptively back-off their request rate when approaching quota limits;
* consuming all the quota according to the exposed limits and then wait.

4.1. Intermediaries

This section documents the considerations advised in Section 16.3.2 of [HTTP].

An intermediary that is not part of the originating service infrastructure and is not aware of the quota-policy semantic used by the Origin Server SHOULD NOT alter the RateLimit fields’ values in such a way as to communicate a more permissive quota-policy; this includes removing the RateLimit fields.

An intermediary MAY alter the RateLimit fields in such a way as to communicate a more restrictive quota-policy when:
* it is aware of the quota-unit semantic used by the Origin Server;

* it implements this specification and enforces a quota-policy which
is more restrictive than the one conveyed in the fields.

An intermediary SHOULD forward a request even when presuming that it
might not be serviced; the service returning the RateLimit fields is
the sole responsible of enforcing the communicated quota-policy, and
it is always free to service incoming requests.

This specification does not mandate any behavior on intermediaries
respect to retries, nor requires that intermediaries have any role in
respecting quota-policies. For example, it is legitimate for a proxy
to retransmit a request without notifying the client, and thus
consuming quota-units.

Privacy considerations (Section 7) provide further guidance on
intermediaries.

4.2. Caching

As is the ordinary case for HTTP caching ([HTTP-CACHING]), a response
with RateLimit fields might be cached and re-used for subsequent
requests. A cached response containing RateLimit fields does not
modify quota counters but could contain stale information. Clients
interested in determining the freshness of the RateLimit fields could
rely on fields such as the Date header field and on the time-window
of a quota-policy.

5. Fields definition

The following RateLimit response fields are defined

5.1. RateLimit-Limit

The "RateLimit-Limit" response field indicates the service-limit
(Section 2.2) associated to the client in the current time-window
(Section 2.1).

If the client exceeds that limit, it MAY not be served.

The field is an Item and its value is a non-negative Integer named
"expiring-limit". Parameters are not allowed.

The expiring-limit MUST be set to the service-limit that is closer to
reach its limit, and the associated time-window MUST either be:
* inferred by the value of RateLimit-Reset field at the moment of
  the reset, or
* communicated out-of-band (e.g. in the documentation).

The RateLimit-Policy field (see Section 5.2), might contain
information on the associated time-window.

RateLimit-Limit: 100

This field MUST NOT occur multiple times and can be sent in a trailer
section.

5.2. RateLimit-Policy

The RateLimit-Policy field response field indicates the quota
associated to the client and its value is informative.

The field is a non-empty List of Items. Each item is a quota policy
(Section 2.3).

This field can convey the time-window associated to the expiring-
limit, like shown in the following example.

RateLimit-Policy: 100;w=10
RateLimit-Limit: 100

Policies using multiple quota limits MAY be returned using multiple
quota-policy Items, like shown in the following two examples:

RateLimit-Policy: 10;w=1, 50;w=60, 1000;w=3600, 5000;w=86400
RateLimit-Policy: 10;w=1;burst=1000, 1000;w=3600

This field MUST NOT occur multiple times and can be sent in a trailer
section.

5.3. RateLimit-Remaining

The RateLimit-Remaining field response field indicates the remaining
quota-units defined in Section 2.2 associated to the client.

The field is an Item and its value is a non-negative Integer
expressed in quota-units (Section 2.2). Parameters are not allowed.

This field MUST NOT occur multiple times and can be sent in a trailer
section.
Clients MUST NOT assume that a positive RateLimit-Remaining field value is a guarantee that further requests will be served.

A low RateLimit-Remaining field value is like a yellow traffic-light for either the number of requests issued in the time-window or the request throughput: the red light may arrive suddenly (see Section 3).

One example of RateLimit-Remaining field use is below.

RateLimit-Remaining: 50

5.4. RateLimit-Reset

The RateLimit-Reset field response field indicates the number of seconds until the quota resets.

The field is a non-negative Integer compatible with the delay-seconds rule, because:

* it does not rely on clock synchronization and is resilient to clock adjustment and clock skew between client and server (see Section 5.6.7 of [HTTP]);

* it mitigates the risk related to thundering herd when too many clients are serviced with the same timestamp.

This field MUST NOT occur multiple times and can be sent in a trailer section.

An example of RateLimit-Reset field use is below.

RateLimit-Reset: 50

The client MUST NOT assume that all its service-limit will be restored after the moment referenced by RateLimit-Reset field. The server MAY arbitrarily alter the RateLimit-Reset field value between subsequent requests e.g. in case of resource saturation or to implement sliding window policies.

6. Security Considerations

6.1. Throttling does not prevent clients from issuing requests

This specification does not prevent clients to make over-quota requests.
Servers should always implement mechanisms to prevent resource exhaustion.

6.2. Information disclosure

Servers should not disclose to untrusted parties operational capacity information that can be used to saturate its infrastructural resources.

While this specification does not mandate whether non 2xx responses consume quota, if 401 and 403 responses count on quota a malicious client could probe the endpoint to get traffic information of another user.

As intermediaries might retransmit requests and consume quota-units without prior knowledge of the user agent, RateLimit fields might reveal the existence of an intermediary to the user agent.

6.3. Remaining quota-units are not granted requests

RateLimit fields convey hints from the server to the clients in order to avoid being throttled out.

Clients MUST NOT consider the quota-units (Section 2.2) returned in RateLimit-Remaining field as a service level agreement.

In case of resource saturation, the server MAY artificially lower the returned values or not serve the request regardless of the advertised quotas.

6.4. Reliability of RateLimit-Reset

Consider that service-limit might not be restored after the moment referenced by RateLimit-Reset field, and the RateLimit-Reset field value do not be considered fixed nor constant.

Subsequent requests might return a higher RateLimit-Reset field value to limit concurrency or implement dynamic or adaptive throttling policies.

6.5. Resource exhaustion

When returning RateLimit-Reset field you must be aware that many throttled clients may come back at the very moment specified.

This is true for Retry-After too.
For example, if the quota resets every day at 18:00:00 and your server returns the RateLimit-Reset field accordingly

Date: Tue, 15 Nov 1994 08:00:00 GMT
RateLimit-Reset: 36000

there’s a high probability that all clients will show up at 18:00:00. This could be mitigated by adding some jitter to the field-value.

Resource exhaustion issues can be associated with quota policies using a large time-window, because a user agent by chance or on purpose might consume most of its quota-units in a significantly shorter interval.

This behavior can be even triggered by the provided RateLimit fields. The following example describes a service with an unconsumed quota-policy of 10000 quota-units per 1000 seconds.

RateLimit-Limit: 10000
RateLimit-Policy: 10000;w=1000
RateLimit-Remaining: 10000
RateLimit-Reset: 10

A client implementing a simple ratio between RateLimit-Remaining field and RateLimit-Reset field could infer an average throughput of 1000 quota-units per second, while the RateLimit-Limit field conveys a quota-policy with an average of 10 quota-units per second. If the service cannot handle such load, it should return either a lower RateLimit-Remaining field value or an higher RateLimit-Reset field value. Moreover, complementing large time-window quota-policies with a short time-window one mitigates those risks.

6.6. Denial of Service

RateLimit fields may assume unexpected values by chance or purpose. For example, an excessively high RateLimit-Remaining field value may be:

* used by a malicious intermediary to trigger a Denial of Service attack or consume client resources boosting its requests;

* passed by a misconfigured server;

or an high RateLimit-Reset field value could inhibit clients to contact the server.

Clients MUST validate the received values to mitigate those risks.
7. Privacy Considerations

Clients that act upon a request to rate limit are potentially re-
identifiable (see Section 7.1 of [DNS-PRIVACY]) because they react to
information that might only be given to them. Note that this might
apply to other fields too (e.g. Retry-After).

Since rate limiting is usually implemented in contexts where clients
are either identified or profiled (e.g. assigning different quota
units to different users), this is rarely a concern.

Privacy enhancing infrastructures using RateLimit fields can define
specific techniques to mitigate the risks of re-identification.

8. IANA Considerations

IANA is requested to update one registry and create one new registry.

Please add the following entries to the "Hypertext Transfer Protocol
(HTTP) Field Name Registry" registry ([HTTP]):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Specification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RateLimit-Limit</td>
<td>permanent</td>
<td>Section 5.1 of RFC nnnn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RateLimit-Remaining</td>
<td>permanent</td>
<td>Section 5.3 of RFC nnnn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RateLimit-Reset</td>
<td>permanent</td>
<td>Section 5.4 of RFC nnnn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RateLimit-Policy</td>
<td>permanent</td>
<td>Section 5.2 of RFC nnnn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1

8.1. RateLimit Parameters Registration

IANA is requested to create a new registry to be called "Hypertext
Transfer Protocol (HTTP) RateLimit Parameters Registry", to be
located at https://www.iana.org/assignments/http-ratelimit-parameters
Registration is done on the advice of a Designated Expert, appointed
by the IESG or their delegate. All entries are Specification
Required ([IANA], Section 4.6).

Registration requests consist of the following information:
* Parameter name: The parameter name, conforming to [STRUCTURED-FIELDS].

* Field name: The RateLimit field for which the parameter is registered. If a parameter is intended to be used with multiple fields, it has to be registered for each one.

* Description: A brief description of the parameter.

* Specification document: A reference to the document that specifies the parameter, preferably including a URI that can be used to retrieve a copy of the document.

* Comments (optional): Any additional information that can be useful.

The initial contents of this registry should be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field Name</th>
<th>Parameter name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Specification</th>
<th>Comments (optional)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RateLimit-Policy</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>Time window</td>
<td>Section 2.3 of RFC nnnn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2

9. References

9.1. Normative References


9.2. Informative References


Appendix A. Rate-limiting and quotas

Servers use quota mechanisms to avoid systems overload, to ensure an equitable distribution of computational resources or to enforce other policies - e.g. monetization.

A basic quota mechanism limits the number of acceptable requests in a given time window, e.g. 10 requests per second.

When quota is exceeded, servers usually do not serve the request replying instead with a 4xx HTTP status code (e.g. 429 or 403) or adopt more aggressive policies like dropping connections.

Quotas may be enforced on different basis (e.g. per user, per IP, per geographic area, ..) and at different levels. For example, an user may be allowed to issue:

- 10 requests per second;
- limited to 60 requests per minute;
- limited to 1000 requests per hour.

Moreover system metrics, statistics and heuristics can be used to implement more complex policies, where the number of acceptable requests and the time window are computed dynamically.

To help clients throttling their requests, servers may expose the counters used to evaluate quota policies via HTTP header fields.

Those response headers may be added by HTTP intermediaries such as API gateways and reverse proxies.

On the web we can find many different rate-limit headers, usually containing the number of allowed requests in a given time window, and when the window is reset.

The common choice is to return three headers containing:
* the maximum number of allowed requests in the time window;
* the number of remaining requests in the current window;
* the time remaining in the current window expressed in seconds or as a timestamp;

A.1. Interoperability issues

A major interoperability issue in throttling is the lack of standard headers, because:

* each implementation associates different semantics to the same header field names;
* header field names proliferates.

User agents interfacing with different servers may thus need to process different headers, or the very same application interface that sits behind different reverse proxies may reply with different throttling headers.

Appendix B. Examples

B.1. Unparameterized responses

B.1.1. Throttling information in responses

The client exhausted its service-limit for the next 50 seconds. The time-window is communicated out-of-band or inferred by the field values.

Request:

GET /items/123 HTTP/1.1
Host: api.example

Response:

HTTP/1.1 200 Ok
Content-Type: application/json
RateLimit-Limit: 100
RateLimit-Remaining: 0
RateLimit-Reset: 50

{"hello": "world"}
Since the field values are not necessarily correlated with the response status code, a subsequent request is not required to fail. The example below shows that the server decided to serve the request even if RateLimit-Remaining field value is 0. Another server, or the same server under other load conditions, could have decided to throttle the request instead.

Request:
GET /items/456 HTTP/1.1
Host: api.example

Response:
HTTP/1.1 200 Ok
Content-Type: application/json
RateLimit-Limit: 100
RateLimit-Remaining: 0
RateLimit-Reset: 48
{"still": "successful"}

B.1.2. Use in conjunction with custom fields

The server uses two custom fields, namely acme-RateLimit-DayLimit and acme-RateLimit-HourLimit to expose the following policy:

* 5000 daily quota-units;
* 1000 hourly quota-units.

The client consumed 4900 quota-units in the first 14 hours.

Despite the next hourly limit of 1000 quota-units, the closest limit to reach is the daily one.

The server then exposes the RateLimit fields to inform the client that:

* it has only 100 quota-units left;
* the window will reset in 10 hours.

Request:
GET /items/123 HTTP/1.1
Host: api.example
Response:

HTTP/1.1 200 Ok
Content-Type: application/json
acme-RateLimit-DayLimit: 5000
acme-RateLimit-HourLimit: 1000
RateLimit-Limit: 5000
RateLimit-Remaining: 100
RateLimit-Reset: 36000

{"hello": "world"}

B.1.3. Use for limiting concurrency

Throttling fields may be used to limit concurrency, advertising limits that are lower than the usual ones in case of saturation, thus increasing availability.

The server adopted a basic policy of 100 quota-units per minute, and in case of resource exhaustion adapts the returned values reducing both RateLimit-Limit and RateLimit-Remaining field values.

After 2 seconds the client consumed 40 quota-units

Request:

GET /items/123 HTTP/1.1
Host: api.example

Response:

HTTP/1.1 200 Ok
Content-Type: application/json
RateLimit-Limit: 100
RateLimit-Remaining: 60
RateLimit-Reset: 58

{"elapsed": 2, "issued": 40}

At the subsequent request - due to resource exhaustion - the server advertises only RateLimit-Remaining: 20.

Request:

GET /items/123 HTTP/1.1
Host: api.example

Response:
HTTP/1.1 200 Ok
Content-Type: application/json
RateLimit-Limit: 100
RateLimit-Remaining: 20
RateLimit-Reset: 56

{"elapsed": 4, "issued": 41}

B.1.4. Use in throttled responses

A client exhausted its quota and the server throttles it sending Retry-After.

In this example, the values of Retry-After and RateLimit-Reset field reference the same moment, but this is not a requirement.

The 429 (Too Many Request) HTTP status code is just used as an example.

Request:
GET /items/123 HTTP/1.1
Host: api.example

Response:
HTTP/1.1 429 Too Many Requests
Content-Type: application/json
Date: Mon, 05 Aug 2019 09:27:00 GMT
Retry-After: Mon, 05 Aug 2019 09:27:05 GMT
RateLimit-Reset: 5
RateLimit-Limit: 100
RateLimit-Remaining: 0

{
"title": "Too Many Requests",
"status": 429,
"detail": "You have exceeded your quota"
}

B.2. Parameterized responses

B.2.1. Throttling window specified via parameter

The client has 99 quota-units left for the next 50 seconds. The time-window is communicated by the w parameter, so we know the throughput is 100 quota-units per minute.
Request:
GET /items/123 HTTP/1.1
Host: api.example

Response:
HTTP/1.1 200 Ok
Content-Type: application/json
RateLimit-Limit: 100
RateLimit-Policy: 100;w=60
RateLimit-Remaining: 99
RateLimit-Reset: 50

{"hello": "world"}

B.2.2. Dynamic limits with parameterized windows

The policy conveyed by the RateLimit-Limit field states that the server accepts 100 quota-units per minute.

To avoid resource exhaustion, the server artificially lowers the actual limits returned in the throttling headers.

The RateLimit-Remaining field then advertises only 9 quota-units for the next 50 seconds to slow down the client.

Note that the server could have lowered even the other values in the RateLimit-Limit field: this specification does not mandate any relation between the field values contained in subsequent responses.

Request:
GET /items/123 HTTP/1.1
Host: api.example

Response:
HTTP/1.1 200 Ok
Content-Type: application/json
RateLimit-Limit: 10
RateLimit-Policy: 100;w=60
RateLimit-Remaining: 9
RateLimit-Reset: 50

{"status": 200,
  "detail": "Just slow down without waiting."
}

B.2.3. Dynamic limits for pushing back and slowing down

Continuing the previous example, let’s say the client waits 10 seconds and performs a new request which, due to resource exhaustion, the server rejects and pushes back, advertising RateLimit-Remaining: 0 for the next 20 seconds.

The server advertises a smaller window with a lower limit to slow down the client for the rest of its original window after the 20 seconds elapse.

Request:
GET /items/123 HTTP/1.1
Host: api.example

Response:

HTTP/1.1 429 Too Many Requests
Content-Type: application/json
RateLimit-Limit: 0
RateLimit-Policy: 15;w=20
RateLimit-Remaining: 0
RateLimit-Reset: 20

{"status": 429,
  "detail": "Wait 20 seconds, then slow down!"}
B.3. Dynamic limits for pushing back with Retry-After and slow down

Alternatively, given the same context where the previous example starts, we can convey the same information to the client via Retry-After, with the advantage that the server can now specify the policy’s nominal limit and window that will apply after the reset, e.g. assuming the resource exhaustion is likely to be gone by then, so the advertised policy does not need to be adjusted, yet we managed to stop requests for a while and slow down the rest of the current window.

Request:
GET /items/123 HTTP/1.1
Host: api.example

Response:
HTTP/1.1 429 Too Many Requests
Content-Type: application/json
Retry-After: 20
RateLimit-Limit: 15
RateLimit-Policy: 100;w=60
Ratelimit-Remaining: 15
Ratelimit-Reset: 40

{  "status": 429,
   "detail": "Wait 20 seconds, then slow down!"
}

Note that in this last response the client is expected to honor Retry-After and perform no requests for the specified amount of time, whereas the previous example would not force the client to stop requests before the reset time is elapsed, as it would still be free to query again the server even if it is likely to have the request rejected.

B.3.1. Missing Remaining information

The server does not expose RateLimit-Remaining field values (for example, because the underlying counters are not available). Instead, it resets the limit counter every second.

It communicates to the client the limit of 10 quota-units per second always returning the couple RateLimit-Limit and RateLimit-Reset field.
Request:
GET /items/123 HTTP/1.1
Host: api.example

Response:
HTTP/1.1 200 Ok
Content-Type: application/json
RateLimit-Limit: 10
Ratelimit-Reset: 1

{"first": "request"}

Request:
GET /items/123 HTTP/1.1
Host: api.example

Response:
HTTP/1.1 200 Ok
Content-Type: application/json
RateLimit-Limit: 10
Ratelimit-Reset: 1

{"second": "request"}

B.3.2. Use with multiple windows

This is a standardized way of describing the policy detailed in Appendix B.1.2:

* 5000 daily quota-units;
* 1000 hourly quota-units.

The client consumed 4900 quota-units in the first 14 hours.

Despite the next hourly limit of 1000 quota-units, the closest limit to reach is the daily one.

The server then exposes the RateLimit fields to inform the client that:

* it has only 100 quota-units left;
* the window will reset in 10 hours;
* the expiring-limit is 5000.

Request:

GET /items/123 HTTP/1.1
Host: api.example

Response:

HTTP/1.1 200 OK
Content-Type: application/json
RateLimit-Limit: 5000
RateLimit-Policy: 1000;w=3600, 5000;w=86400
RateLimit-Remaining: 100
RateLimit-Reset: 36000

{"hello": "world"}

FAQ

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

1. Why defining standard fields for throttling?

   To simplify enforcement of throttling policies.

2. Can I use RateLimit fields in throttled responses (eg with status code 429)?

   Yes, you can.

3. Are those specs tied to RFC 6585?

   No. [RFC6585] defines the 429 status code and we use it just as an example of a throttled request, that could instead use even 403 or whatever status code. The goal of this specification is to standardize the name and semantic of three ratelimit fields widely used on the internet. Stricter relations with status codes or error response payloads would impose behaviors to all the existing implementations making the adoption more complex.

4. Why don’t pass the throttling scope as a parameter?

   The word "scope" can have different meanings: for example it can be an URL, or an authorization scope. Since authorization is out of the scope of this document (see Section 1.1), and that we rely only on [HTTP], in Section 1.1 we defined "scope" in terms of URL.
Since clients are not required to process quota policies (see Section 4), we could add a new "RateLimit-Scope" field to this spec. See this discussion on a similar thread (https://github.com/httpwg/http-core/pull/317#issuecomment-585868767)

Specific ecosystems can still bake their own prefixed parameters, such as acme-auth-scope or acme-url-scope and ensure that clients process them. This behavior cannot be relied upon when communicating between different ecosystems.

We are open to suggestions: comment on this issue (https://github.com/ioggstream/draft-polli-ratelimit-headers/issues/70)

5. Why using delay-seconds instead of a UNIX Timestamp? Why not using subsecond precision?

Using delay-seconds aligns with Retry-After, which is returned in similar contexts, eg on 429 responses.

Timestamps require a clock synchronization protocol (see Section 5.6.7 of [HTTP]). This may be problematic (e.g. clock adjustment, clock skew, failure of hardcoded clock synchronization servers, IoT devices, ..). Moreover timestamps may not be monotonically increasing due to clock adjustment. See Another NTP client failure story (https://community.ntppool.org/t/another-ntp-client-failure-story/1014/)

We did not use subsecond precision because:

* that is more subject to system clock correction like the one implemented via the adjtimex() Linux system call;

* response-time latency may not make it worth. A brief discussion on the subject is on the httpwg ml (https://lists.w3.org/Archives/Public/ietf-httpwg/2019JulSep/0202.html)

* almost all rate-limit headers implementations do not use it.

6. Why not support multiple quota remaining?

While this might be of some value, my experience suggests that overly-complex quota implementations results in lower effectiveness of this policy. This spec allows the client to easily focusing on RateLimit-Remaining and RateLimit-Reset.
7. Shouldn’t I limit concurrency instead of request rate?

You can use this specification to limit concurrency at the HTTP level (see {#use-for-limiting-concurrency}) and help clients to shape their requests avoiding being throttled out.

A problematic way to limit concurrency is connection dropping, especially when connections are multiplexed (e.g. HTTP/2) because this results in unserviced client requests, which is something we want to avoid.

A semantic way to limit concurrency is to return 503 + Retry-After in case of resource saturation (e.g. thrashing, connection queues too long, Service Level Objectives not meet, ...). Saturation conditions can be either dynamic or static: all this is out of the scope for the current document.

8. Do a positive value of RateLimit-Remaining field imply any service guarantee for my future requests to be served?

No. FAQ integrated in Section 5.3.

9. Is the quota-policy definition Section 2.3 too complex?

You can always return the simplest form of the 3 fields

```
RateLimit-Limit: 100
RateLimit-Remaining: 50
RateLimit-Reset: 60
```

The key runtime value is the first element of the list: expiring-limit, the others quota-policy are informative. So for the following field:

```
RateLimit-Limit: 100
RateLimit-Policy: 100;w=60;burst=1000;comment="sliding window", 5000;w=3600;burst=0;comment="fixed window"
```

the key value is the one referencing the lowest limit: 100

1. Can we use shorter names? Why don’t put everything in one field?

The most common syntax we found on the web is X-RateLimit-* and when starting this I-D we opted for it (https://github.com/loggstream/draft-polli-ratelimit-headers/issues/34#issuecomment-519366481)

The basic form of those fields is easily parseable, even by implementers processing responses using technologies like dynamic interpreter with limited syntax.
Using a single field complicates parsing and takes a significantly different approach from the existing ones: this can limit adoption.

1. Why don’t mention connections?

   Beware of the term "connection": it is just _one_ possible saturation cause. Once you go that path you will expose other infrastructural details (bandwidth, CPU, .. see Section 6.2) and complicate client compliance; - it is an infrastructural detail defined in terms of server and network rather than the consumed service. This specification protects the services first, and then the infrastructures through client cooperation (see Section 6.1). RateLimit fields enable sending _on the same connection_ different limit values on each response, depending on the policy scope (e.g. per-user, per-custom-key, ..)

2. Can intermediaries alter RateLimit fields?

   Generally, they should not because it might result in unserviced requests. There are reasonable use cases for intermediaries mangling RateLimit fields though, e.g. when they enforce stricter quota-policies, or when they are an active component of the service. In those case we will consider them as part of the originating infrastructure.

3. Why the w parameter is just informative? Could it be used by a client to determine the request rate?

   A non-informative w parameter might be fine in an environment where clients and servers are tightly coupled. Conveying policies with this detail on a large scale would be very complex and implementations would be likely not interoperable. We thus decided to leave w as an informational parameter and only rely on RateLimit-Limit, RateLimit-Remaining field and RateLimit-Reset field for defining the throttling behavior.

RateLimit fields currently used on the web

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

Commonly used header field names are:

* X-RateLimit-Limit, X-RateLimit-Remaining, X-RateLimit-Reset;
* X-Rate-Limit-Limit, X-Rate-Limit-Remaining, X-Rate-Limit-Reset.
There are variants too, where the window is specified in the header field name, eg:

* x-ratelimit-limit-minute, x-ratelimit-limit-hour, x-ratelimit-limit-day
* x-ratelimit-remaining-minute, x-ratelimit-remaining-hour, x-ratelimit-remaining-day

Here are some interoperability issues:

* X-RateLimit-Remaining references different values, depending on the implementation:
  - seconds remaining to the window expiration
  - milliseconds remaining to the window expiration
  - seconds since UTC, in UNIX Timestamp [UNIX]
  - a datetime, either IMF-fixdate [HTTP] or [RFC3339]

* different headers, with the same semantic, are used by different implementers:
  - X-RateLimit-Limit and X-Rate-Limit-Limit
  - X-RateLimit-Remaining and X-Rate-Limit-Remaining
  - X-RateLimit-Reset and X-Rate-Limit-Reset

The semantic of RateLimit-Remaining depends on the windowing algorithm. A sliding window policy for example may result in having a RateLimit-Remaining field value related to the ratio between the current and the maximum throughput. e.g.

RateLimit-Limit: 12
RateLimit-Policy: 12;w=1
RateLimit-Remaining: 6 ; using 50% of throughput, that is 6 units/s
RateLimit-Reset: 1

If this is the case, the optimal solution is to achieve

RateLimit-Limit: 12
RateLimit-Policy: 12;w=1
RateLimit-Remaining: 1 ; using 100% of throughput, that is 12 units/s
RateLimit-Reset: 1
At this point you should stop increasing your request rate.
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1. Introduction

HTTP status codes (Section 15 of [HTTP]) cannot always convey enough information about errors to be helpful. While humans using Web browsers can often understand an HTML [HTML5] response body, non-human consumers of HTTP APIs have difficulty doing so.

To address that shortcoming, this specification defines simple JSON [JSON] and XML [XML] document formats and a HTTP field to describe the specifics of problem(s) encountered -- "problem details".

For example, consider a response indicating that the client’s account doesn’t have enough credit. The API’s designer might decide to use the 403 Forbidden status code to inform HTTP-generic software (such as client libraries, caches, and proxies) of the response’s general semantics. API-specific problem details (such as the why the server refused the request and the applicable account balance) can be carried in the response content, so that the client can act upon them appropriately (for example, triggering a transfer of more credit into the account).

This specification identifies the specific "problem type" (e.g., "out of credit") with a URI [URI]. HTTP APIs can use URIs under their control to identify problems specific to them, or can reuse existing ones to facilitate interoperability and leverage common semantics (see Section 5.2).

Problem details can contain other information, such as a URI identifying the problem’s specific occurrence (effectively giving an identifier to the concept "The time Joe didn’t have enough credit last Thursday"), which can be useful for support or forensic purposes.

The data model for problem details is a JSON [JSON] object; when serialized as a JSON document, it uses the "application/problem+json" media type. Appendix B defines an equivalent XML format, which uses the "application/problem+xml" media type.

Note that problem details are (naturally) not the only way to convey the details of a problem in HTTP. If the response is still a representation of a resource, for example, it’s often preferable to describe the relevant details in that application’s format. Likewise, defined HTTP status codes cover many situations with no need to convey extra detail.

This specification’s aim is to define common error formats for applications that need one so that they aren’t required to define their own, or worse, tempted to redefine the semantics of existing HTTP status codes. Even if an application chooses not to use it to convey errors, reviewing its design can help guide the design decisions faced when conveying errors in an existing format.

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.
This document uses the following terminology from [STRUCTURED-FIELDS] to specify syntax and parsing: Dictionary, String, and Integer.

3. The Problem Details JSON Object

The canonical model for problem details is a JSON [JSON] object. When serialized in a JSON document, that format is identified with the "application/problem+json" media type.

For example:

POST /purchase HTTP/1.1
Host: store.example.com
Content-Type: application/json
Accept: application/json, application/problem+json

{
    "item": 123456,
    "quantity": 2
}

HTTP/1.1 403 Forbidden
Content-Type: application/problem+json
Content-Language: en

{
    "type": "https://example.com/probs/out-of-credit",
    "title": "You do not have enough credit.",
    "detail": "Your current balance is 30, but that costs 50.",
    "instance": "/account/12345/msgs/abc",
    "balance": 30,
    "accounts": ["/account/12345",
                  "/account/67890"]
}

Here, the out-of-credit problem (identified by its type) indicates the reason for the 403 in "title", identifies the specific problem occurrence with "instance", gives occurrence-specific details in "detail", and adds two extensions: "balance" conveys the account’s balance, and "accounts" lists links where the account can be topped up.

When designed to accommodate it, problem-specific extensions can allow more than one instance of the same problem type to be conveyed. For example:
POST /details HTTP/1.1
Host: account.example.com
Accept: application/json

{
  "age": 42.3,
  "profile": {
    "color": "yellow"
  }
}

HTTP/1.1 400 Bad Request
Content-Type: application/problem+json
Content-Language: en

{
  "type": "https://example.net/validation-error",
  "title": "Your request is not valid.",
  "errors": [
    {
      "detail": "must be a positive integer",
      "pointer": "#/age"
    },
    {
      "detail": "must be 'green', 'red' or 'blue'",
      "pointer": "#/profile/color"
    }
  ]
}

The fictional problem type here defines the "errors" extension, an array that describes the details of each validation error. Each member is an object containing "detail" to describe the issue, and "pointer" to locate the problem within the request’s content using a JSON Pointer [JSON-POINTER].

When an API encounters multiple problems that do not share the same type, it is RECOMMENDED that the most relevant or urgent problem be represented in the response. While it is possible to create generic "batch" problem types that convey multiple, disparate types, they do not map well into HTTP semantics.

Note also that the API has responded with the application/problem+json type, even though the client did not list it in Accept, as is allowed by HTTP (see Section 12.5.1 of [HTTP]).
3.1. Members of a Problem Details Object

Problem detail objects can have the following members. If a member’s value type does not match the specified type, the member MUST be ignored -- i.e., processing will continue as if the member had not been present.

3.1.1. "type"

The "type" member is a JSON string containing a URI reference [URI] that identifies the problem type. Consumers MUST use the "type" URI (after resolution, if necessary) problem’s primary identifier.

When this member is not present, its value is assumed to be "about:blank".

If the type URI is a locator (e.g., those with a "http" or "https" scheme), dereferencing it SHOULD provide human-readable documentation for the problem type (e.g., using HTML [HTML5]). However, consumers SHOULD NOT automatically dereference the type URI, unless they do so when providing information to developers (e.g., when a debugging tool is in use).

When "type" contains a relative URI, it is resolved relative to the document’s base URI, as per [URI], Section 5. However, using relative URIs can cause confusion, and they might not be handled correctly by all implementations.

For example, if the two resources "https://api.example.org/foo/bar/123" and "https://api.example.org/widget/456" both respond with a "type" equal to the relative URI reference "example-problem", when resolved they will identify different resources ("https://api.example.org/foo/bar/example-problem" and "https://api.example.org/widget/example-problem" respectively). As a result, it is RECOMMENDED that absolute URIs be used in "type" when possible, and that when relative URIs are used, they include the full path (e.g., "/types/123").

The type URI can also be a non-resolvable URI. For example, the tag URI scheme [TAG] can be used to uniquely identify problem types:

tag:mnot@mnot.net,2021-09-17:OutOfLuck
Non-resolvable URIs ought not be used when there is some future possibility that it might become desirable to do so. For example, if an API designer used the URI above and later adopted a tool that resolves type URIs to discover information about the error, taking advantage of that capability would require switching to a resolvable URI, creating a new identity for the problem type and thus introducing a breaking change.

3.1.2. "status"

The "status" member is a JSON number indicating the HTTP status code ([HTTP], Section 15) generated by the origin server for this occurrence of the problem.

The "status" member, if present, is only advisory; it conveys the HTTP status code used for the convenience of the consumer. Generators MUST use the same status code in the actual HTTP response, to assure that generic HTTP software that does not understand this format still behaves correctly. See Section 6 for further caveats regarding its use.

Consumers can use the status member to determine what the original status code used by the generator was, in cases where it has been changed (e.g., by an intermediary or cache), and when message bodies persist without HTTP information. Generic HTTP software will still use the HTTP status code.

3.1.3. "title"

The "title" member is a JSON string containing a short, human-readable summary of the problem type.

It SHOULD NOT change from occurrence to occurrence of the problem, except for localization (e.g., using proactive content negotiation; see [HTTP], Section 12.1).

The "title" string is advisory and included only for users who are not aware of the semantics of the URI and can not discover them (e.g., during offline log analysis).

3.1.4. "detail"

The "detail" member is a JSON string containing a human-readable explanation specific to this occurrence of the problem.

The "detail" member, if present, ought to focus on helping the client correct the problem, rather than giving debugging information.
Consumers SHOULD NOT parse the "detail" member for information; extensions are more suitable and less error-prone ways to obtain such information.

3.1.5. "instance"

The "instance" member is a JSON string containing a URI reference that identifies the specific occurrence of the problem.

When the "instance" URI is dereferenceable, the problem details object can be fetched from it. It might also return information about the problem occurrence in other formats through use of proactive content negotiation (see [HTTP], Section 12.5.1).

When the "instance" URI is not dereferenceable, it serves as a unique identifier for the problem occurrence that may be of significance to the server, but is opaque to the client.

When "instance" contains a relative URI, it is resolved relative to the document’s base URI, as per [URI], Section 5. However, using relative URIs can cause confusion, and they might not be handled correctly by all implementations.

For example, if the two resources "https://api.example.org/foo/bar/123" and "https://api.example.org/widget/456" both respond with an "instance" equal to the relative URI reference "example-instance", when resolved they will identify different resources ("https://api.example.org/foo/bar/example-instance" and "https://api.example.org/widget/example-instance" respectively). As a result, it is RECOMMENDED that absolute URIs be used in "instance" when possible, and that when relative URIs are used, they include the full path (e.g., "/instances/123").

3.2. Extension Members

Problem type definitions MAY extend the problem details object with additional members that are specific to that problem type.

For example, our "out of credit" problem above defines two such extensions -- "balance" and "accounts" to convey additional, problem-specific information.

Similarly, the "validation error" example defines a "errors" extension that contains a list of individual error occurrences found, with details and a pointer to the location of each.
Clients consuming problem details MUST ignore any such extensions that they don't recognize; this allows problem types to evolve and include additional information in the future.

Future updates to this specification might define additional members that are available to all problem types, distinguished by a name starting with "*". To avoid conflicts, extension member names SHOULD NOT start with the "*" character.

When creating extensions, problem type authors should choose their names carefully. To be used in the XML format (see Appendix B), they will need to conform to the Name rule in Section 2.3 of [XML]. To be used in the HTTP field (see Section 4), they will need to conform to the Dictionary key syntax defined in Section 3.2 of [STRUCTURED-FIELDS].

Problem type authors that wish their extensions to be usable in the Problem HTTP field (see Section 4) will also need to define the Structured Type(s) that their values are mapped to.

4. The Problem HTTP Field

Some problems might best be conveyed in a HTTP header or trailer field, rather than in the message content. For example, when a problem does not prevent a successful response from being generated, or when the problem's details are useful to software that does not inspect the response content.

The Problem HTTP field allows a limited expression of a problem object in HTTP headers or trailers. It is a Dictionary Structured Field (Section 3.2 of [STRUCTURED-FIELDS]) that can contain the following keys, whose semantics and related requirements are inherited from problem objects:

- **type**: the type value (see Section 3.1.1), as a String
- **status**: the status value (see Section 3.1.2), as an Integer
- **title**: The title value (see Section 3.1.3), as a String
- **detail**: The detail value (see Section 3.1.4), as a String
- **instance**: The instance value (see Section 3.1.5), as a String

The title and detail values MUST NOT be serialized in the Problem field if they contain characters that are not allowed by String; see Section 3.3.3 of [STRUCTURED-FIELDS]. Practically, this has the effect of limiting them to ASCII strings.
An extension member (see Section 3.2) MAY occur in the Problem field if its name is compatible with the syntax of Dictionary keys (see Section 3.2 of [STRUCTURED-FIELDS]) and if the defining problem type specifies a Structured Type to serialize the value into.

For example:

HTTP/1.1 200 OK
Content-Type: application/json
Problem: type="https://example.net/problems/almost-out",
  title="you’re almost out of credit", credit_left=20

5. Defining New Problem Types

When an HTTP API needs to define a response that indicates an error condition, it might be appropriate to do so by defining a new problem type.

Before doing so, it’s important to understand what they are good for, and what’s better left to other mechanisms.

Problem details are not a debugging tool for the underlying implementation; rather, they are a way to expose greater detail about the HTTP interface itself. Designers of new problem types need to carefully consider the Security Considerations (Section 6), in particular, the risk of exposing attack vectors by exposing implementation internals through error messages.

Likewise, truly generic problems -- i.e., conditions that might apply to any resource on the Web -- are usually better expressed as plain status codes. For example, a "write access disallowed" problem is probably unnecessary, since a 403 Forbidden status code in response to a PUT request is self-explanatory.

Finally, an application might have a more appropriate way to carry an error in a format that it already defines. Problem details are intended to avoid the necessity of establishing new "fault" or "error" document formats, not to replace existing domain-specific formats.

That said, it is possible to add support for problem details to existing HTTP APIs using HTTP content negotiation (e.g., using the Accept request header to indicate a preference for this format; see [HTTP], Section 12.5.1).

New problem type definitions MUST document:

1. a type URI (typically, with the "http" or "https" scheme),
2. a title that appropriately describes it (think short), and
3. the HTTP status code for it to be used with.

Problem type definitions MAY specify the use of the Retry-After
response header ([HTTP], Section 10.2.3) in appropriate
circumstances.

A problem’s type URI SHOULD resolve to HTML [HTML5] documentation
that explains how to resolve the problem.

A problem type definition MAY specify additional members on the
problem details object. For example, an extension might use typed
links [WEB-LINKING] to another resource that machines can use to
resolve the problem.

If such additional members are defined, their names SHOULD start with
a letter (ALPHA, as per [ABNF], Appendix B.1) and SHOULD comprise
characters from ALPHA, DIGIT ([ABNF], Appendix B.1), and "_" (so that
it can be serialized in formats other than JSON), and they SHOULD be
three characters or longer.

5.1. Example

For example, if you are publishing an HTTP API to your online
shopping cart, you might need to indicate that the user is out of
credit (our example from above), and therefore cannot make the
purchase.

If you already have an application-specific format that can
accommodate this information, it’s probably best to do that.
However, if you don’t, you might use one of the problem details
formats -- JSON if your API is JSON-based, or XML if it uses that
format.

To do so, you might look in the registry (Section 5.2) for an
already-defined type URI that suits your purposes. If one is
available, you can reuse that URI.

If one isn’t available, you could mint and document a new type URI
(which ought to be under your control and stable over time), an
appropriate title and the HTTP status code that it will be used with,
along with what it means and how it should be handled.

5.2. Registered Problem Types

This specification defines the HTTP Problem Type registry for common,
widely-used problem type URIs, to promote reuse.
The policy for this registry is Specification Required, per [RFC8126], Section 4.5.

When evaluating requests, the Expert(s) should consider community feedback, how well-defined the problem type is, and this specification’s requirements. Vendor-specific, application-specific, and deployment-specific values are not registrable. Specification documents should be published in a stable, freely available manner (ideally located with a URL), but need not be standards.

Registrations MAY use the prefix "https://iana.org/assignments/http-problem-types#" for the type URI.

Registration requests should use the following template:

* Type URI: [a URI for the problem type]
* Title: [a short description of the problem type]
* Recommended HTTP status code: [what status code is most appropriate to use with the type]
* Reference: [to a specification defining the type]

See the registry at https://iana.org/assignments/http-problem-types (https://iana.org/assignments/http-problem-types) for details on where to send registration requests.

5.2.1. about:blank

This specification registers one Problem Type, "about:blank".

* Type URI: about:blank
* Title: See HTTP Status Code
* Recommended HTTP status code: N/A
* Reference: [this document]

The "about:blank" URI [ABOUT], when used as a problem type, indicates that the problem has no additional semantics beyond that of the HTTP status code.

When "about:blank" is used, the title SHOULD be the same as the recommended HTTP status phrase for that code (e.g., "Not Found" for 404, and so on), although it MAY be localized to suit client preferences (expressed with the Accept-Language request header).
Please note that according to how the "type" member is defined (Section 3.1), the "about:blank" URI is the default value for that member. Consequently, any problem details object not carrying an explicit "type" member implicitly uses this URI.

6. Security Considerations

When defining a new problem type, the information included must be carefully vetted. Likewise, when actually generating a problem -- however it is serialized -- the details given must also be scrutinized.

Risks include leaking information that can be exploited to compromise the system, access to the system, or the privacy of users of the system.

Generators providing links to occurrence information are encouraged to avoid making implementation details such as a stack dump available through the HTTP interface, since this can expose sensitive details of the server implementation, its data, and so on.

The "status" member duplicates the information available in the HTTP status code itself, bringing the possibility of disagreement between the two. Their relative precedence is not clear, since a disagreement might indicate that (for example) an intermediary has changed the HTTP status code in transit (e.g., by a proxy or cache). Generic HTTP software (such as proxies, load balancers, firewalls, and virus scanners) are unlikely to know of or respect the status code conveyed in this member.

7. IANA Considerations

Please update the "application/problem+json" and "application/problem+xml" registrations in the "Media Types" registry to refer to this document.

Please create the "HTTP Problem Types Registry" as specified in Section 5.2, and populate it with "about:blank" as per Section 5.2.1.

Please register the following entry into the "Hypertext Transfer Protocol (HTTP) Field Name Registry":

Field Name: Problem
Status: Permanent
Reference: RFC nnnn
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Appendix A. JSON Schema for HTTP Problems

This section presents a non-normative JSON Schema [JSON-SCHEMA] for HTTP Problem Details. If there is any disagreement between it and the text of the specification, the latter prevails.
{ "$schema": "https://json-schema.org/draft/2020-12/schema", "title": "A problem object RFC 7807bis", "type": "object", "properties": { "type": { "type": "string", "format": "uri-reference", "description": "A URI reference RFC3986 that identifies the problem type." }, "title": { "type": "string", "description": "A short, human-readable summary of the problem type. It SHOULD NOT change from occurrence to occurrence of the problem, except for purposes of localization (e.g., using proactive content negotiation; see RFC7231, Section 3.4)" }, "status": { "type": "integer", "description": "The HTTP status code (RFC7231, Section 6) generated by the origin server for this occurrence of the problem.\", "minimum": 100, "maximum": 599 }, "detail": { "type": "string", "description": "A human-readable explanation specific to this occurrence of the problem." }, "instance": { "type": "string", "format": "uri-reference", "description": "A URI reference that identifies the specific occurrence of the problem. It may or may not yield further information if dereferenced." } } }

Appendix B. HTTP Problems and XML

HTTP-based APIs that use XML [XML] can express problem details using the format defined in this appendix.

The RELAX NG schema [ISO-19757-2] for the XML format is:
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default namespace ns = "urn:ietf:rfc:7807"

start = problem

problem =
    element problem {
        ( element type { xsd:anyURI }? 
        & element title { xsd:string }? 
        & element detail { xsd:string }? 
        & element status { xsd:positiveInteger }? 
        & element instance { xsd:anyURI }? ),
        anyNsElement
    }

anyNsElement =
    ( element ns:* { anyNsElement | text } 
    | attribute * { text })*

Note that this schema is only intended as documentation, and not as a normative schema that captures all constraints of the XML format. It is possible to use other XML schema languages to define a similar set of constraints (depending on the features of the chosen schema language).

The media type for this format is "application/problem+xml".

Extension arrays and objects are serialized into the XML format by considering an element containing a child or children to represent an object, except for elements that contain only child element(s) named 'i', which are considered arrays. For example, the example above appears in XML as follows:

HTTP/1.1 403 Forbidden
Content-Type: application/problem+xml
Content-Language: en

<?xml version="1.0" encoding="UTF-8"?>
<problem xmlns="urn:ietf:rfc:7807">
    <type>https://example.com/probs/out-of-credit</type>
    <title>You do not have enough credit.</title>
    <detail>Your current balance is 30, but that costs 50.</detail>
    <instance>https://example.net/account/12345/msgs/abc</instance>
    <balance>30</balance>
    <accounts>
    <i>https://example.net/account/12345</i>
    <i>https://example.net/account/67890</i>
    </accounts>
</problem>
This format uses an XML namespace, primarily to allow embedding it into other XML-based formats; it does not imply that it can or should be extended with elements or attributes in other namespaces. The RELAX NG schema explicitly only allows elements from the one namespace used in the XML format. Any extension arrays and objects MUST be serialized into XML markup using only that namespace.

When using the XML format, it is possible to embed an XML processing instruction in the XML that instructs clients to transform the XML, using the referenced XSLT code [XSLT]. If this code is transforming the XML into (X)HTML, then it is possible to serve the XML format, and yet have clients capable of performing the transformation display human-friendly (X)HTML that is rendered and displayed at the client. Note that when using this method, it is advisable to use XSLT 1.0 in order to maximize the number of clients capable of executing the XSLT code.

Appendix C. Using Problem Details with Other Formats

In some situations, it can be advantageous to embed problem details in formats other than those described here. For example, an API that uses HTML [HTML5] might want to also use HTML for expressing its problem details.

Problem details can be embedded in other formats either by encapsulating one of the existing serializations (JSON or XML) into that format or by translating the model of a problem detail (as specified in Section 3) into the format’s conventions.

For example, in HTML, a problem could be embedded by encapsulating JSON in a script tag:

```html
<script type="application/problem+json">
{
  "type": "https://example.com/probs/out-of-credit",
  "title": "You do not have enough credit.",
  "detail": "Your current balance is 30, but that costs 50."
  "instance": "/account/12345/msgs/abc",
  "balance": 30,
  "accounts": ["/account/12345",
               "/account/67890"]
}
</script>
```

or by inventing a mapping into RDFa [RDFA].
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This specification does not make specific recommendations regarding embedding problem details in other formats; the appropriate way to embed them depends both upon the format in use and application of that format.
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Abstract

This document registers the application/yaml media type and the +yaml structured syntax suffix on the IANA Media Types registry.
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1. Introduction

YAML [YAML] is a data serialization format that is widely used on the Internet, including in the API sector (e.g. see [OAS]), but the relevant media type and structured syntax suffix previously had not been registered by IANA.

To increase interoperability when exchanging YAML data and leverage content negotiation mechanisms when exchanging YAML resources, this specification registers the application/yaml media type and the +yaml structured syntax suffix.

Moreover, it provides security considerations and interoperability considerations related to [YAML], including its relation with [JSON].

1.1. Notational Conventions

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "NOT RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in BCP 14 [RFC2119] [RFC8174] when, and only when, they appear in all capitals, as shown here. These words may also appear in this document in lower case as plain English words, absent their normative meanings.

This document uses the Augmented BNF defined in [RFC5234] and updated by [RFC7405].

The terms "content", "content negotiation", "resource", and "user agent" in this document are to be interpreted as in [SEMANTICS].

The terms "fragment" and "fragment identifier" in this document are to be interpreted as in [URI].

The terms "node", "alias node", "anchor" and "named anchor" in this document are to be interpreted as in [YAML].

1.2. Fragment identification

This section describes how to use alias nodes (see Section 3.2.2.2 and 7.1 of [YAML]) as fragment identifiers to designate nodes.

A YAML alias node can be represented in a URI fragment identifier by encoding it into octets using UTF-8 [UTF-8], while percent-encoding those characters not allowed by the fragment rule in Section 3.5 of [URI].
If multiple nodes would match a fragment identifier, the first such match is selected.

A fragment identifier is not guaranteed to reference an existing node. Therefore, applications SHOULD define how an unresolved alias node ought to be handled.

Users concerned with interoperability of fragment identifiers:

* SHOULD limit alias nodes to a set of characters that do not require encoding to be expressed as URI fragment identifiers: this is generally possible since named anchors are a serialization detail;

* SHOULD NOT use alias nodes that match multiple nodes.

In the example resource below, the URL file.yaml#*foo references the alias node *foo pointing to the node with value scalar; whereas the URL file.yaml#*bar references the alias node *bar pointing to the node with value [ some, sequence, items ].

```yaml
---
one: &foo scalar
two: &bar
  - some
  - sequence
  - items
```

2. Media Type and Structured Syntax Suffix registrations

This section describes the information required to register the above media type according to [MEDIATYPE]

2.1. Media Type application/yaml

The media type for YAML text is application/yaml; the following information serves as the registration form for this media type.

Type name: application

Subtype name: yaml

Required parameters: None

Optional parameters: None; unrecognized parameters should be ignored

Encoding considerations: binary
Security considerations: see Section 4 of this document

Interoperability considerations: see Section 3 of this document

Published specification: [YAML]

Applications that use this media type: HTTP

Fragment identifier considerations: An empty fragment identifier references the root node.

A fragment identifier starting with "*" is to be interpreted as a YAML alias node Section 1.2.

A fragment identifier starting with "/" is to be interpreted as a JSON Pointer [JSON-POINTER] and is evaluated on the YAML representation graph, walking through alias nodes; this syntax can only reference YAML nodes that are on a path that is made up of nodes interoperable with the JSON data model (see Section 3.2).

Additional information:

* Deprecated alias names for this type: application/x-yaml, text/yaml, text/x-yaml
* Magic number(s) n/a
* File extension(s): yaml, yml
* Macintosh file type code(s): n/a

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

Intended usage: COMMON

Restrictions on usage: None.

Author: See Authors’ Addresses section.

Change controller: n/a

2.2. The +yaml Structured Syntax Suffix

The suffix +yaml MAY be used with any media type whose representation follows that established for application/yaml. The media type structured syntax suffix registration form follows. See [MEDIATYPE] for definitions of each of the registration form headings.
Name: YAML Ain’t Markup Language (YAML)

+suffix: +yaml

References: [YAML]

Encoding considerations: see Section 2.1

Fragment identifier considerations: Differently from application/yaml, there is no fragment identification syntax defined for +yaml.

A specific xxx/yyy+yaml media type needs to define the syntax and semantics for fragment identifiers because the ones in Section 2.1 do not apply unless explicitly expressed.

Interoperability considerations: See Section 2.1

Security considerations: See Section 2.1

Contact: See Authors’ Addresses section.

Author: See Authors’ Addresses section

Change controller: n/a

3. Interoperability Considerations

3.1. YAML is an Evolving Language

YAML is an evolving language and, over time, some features have been added and others removed.

While this document is based on a given YAML version [YAML], the media type registration does not imply a specific version. This allows content negotiation of version-independent YAML resources.

Implementers concerned about features related to a specific YAML version can specify it in documents using the %YAML directive (see Section 6.8.1 of [YAML]).

3.2. YAML and JSON

When using flow collection styles (see Section 7.4 of [YAML]) a YAML document could look like JSON [JSON], thus similar interoperability considerations apply.
When using YAML as a more efficient format to serialize information intended to be consumed as JSON, information can be discarded: this includes comments (see Section 3.2.3.3 of [YAML]) and alias nodes (see Section 7.1 of [YAML]), that do not have a JSON counterpart.

# This comment will be lost
# when serializing in JSON.

Title:
  type: string
  maxLength: &text_limit 64

Name:
  type: string
  maxLength: *text_limit  # Replaced by the value 64.

Figure 1: JSON replaces alias nodes with static values.

Implementers need to ensure that relevant information will not be lost during the processing. For example, they might consider acceptable that alias nodes are replaced by static values.

In some cases an implementer may want to define a list of allowed YAML features, taking into account that the following ones might have interoperability issues with JSON:

* non UTF-8 encoding, since YAML supports UTF-16 and UTF-32 in addition to UTF-8;

* mapping keys that are not strings;

* circular references represented using anchor (see Section 4.2 and Figure 3);

* .inf and .nan float values, since JSON does not support them;

* non-JSON types, including the ones associated with tags like !!timestamp that were included in the default schema of older YAML versions;

* tags in general, and specifically the ones that do not map to JSON types like custom and local tags such as !!python/object and !mytag (see Section 2.4 of [YAML]);
%YAML 1.2
---
non-json-keys:
  0: a number
  2020-01-01: a timestamp
  [0, 1]: a sequence
  ? {k: v}
  : a map
non-json-value: 2020-01-01

Figure 2: Example of mapping keys not supported in JSON

3.3. Fragment identifiers

To allow fragment identifiers to traverse alias nodes, the YAML representation graph needs to be generated before the fragment identifier evaluation. It is important that this evaluation will not cause the issues mentioned in Section 3.2 and in Security considerations (Section 4) such as infinite loops and unexpected code execution.

Implementers need to consider that the YAML version and supported features (e.g. merge keys) can impact on the generation of the representation graph (see Figure 8).

In Section 2.1, this document extends the use of specifications based on the JSON data model with support for YAML fragment identifiers. This is to improve the interoperability of already consolidated practices, such as the one of writing OpenAPI documents [OAS] in YAML.

Appendix A provides a non exhaustive list of examples that could help understanding interoperability issues related to fragment identifiers.

4. Security Considerations

Security requirements for both media type and media type suffix registrations are discussed in Section 4.6 of [MEDIATYPE].

4.1. Arbitrary Code Execution

Care should be used when using YAML tags, because their resolution might trigger unexpected code execution.
Code execution in deserializers should be disabled by default, and only be enabled explicitly. In those cases, the implementation should ensure - for example, via specific functions - that the code execution results in strictly bounded time/memory limits.

Many implementations provide safe deserializers addressing these issues.

4.2. Resource Exhaustion

YAML documents are rooted, connected, directed graphs and can contain reference cycles, so they can't be treated as simple trees (see Section 3.2.1 of [YAML]). An implementation that attempts to do that can infinite-loop traversing the YAML representation graph at some point, for example:

* when trying to serialize it JSON;
* or when searching/identifying nodes using specifications based on the JSON data model (e.g. [JSON-POINTER]).

```
x: &x
  y: *x
```

Figure 3: A cyclic document

Even if a document is not cyclic, treating it as a simple tree could lead to improper behaviors (such as the "billion laughs" problem).

```
x1: &a1 ["a", "a"]
x2: &a2 [a1, a1]
x3: &a3 [a2, a2]
```

Figure 4: A billion laughs document

This can be addressed using processors limiting the anchor recursion depth and validating the input before processing it; even in these cases it is important to carefully test the implementation you are going to use. The same considerations apply when serializing a YAML representation graph in a format that does not support reference cycles (see Section 3.2).

5. IANA Considerations

This specification defines the following new Internet media type [MEDIATYPE].
IANA has updated the "Media Types" registry at https://www.iana.org/assignments/media-types with the registration information provided below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media Type</th>
<th>Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>application/yaml</td>
<td>Section 2.1 of this document</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1

IANA has updated the "Structured Syntax Suffixes" registry at https://www.iana.org/assignments/media-type-structured-suffix with the registration information provided below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+yaml</td>
<td>Section 2.2 of this document</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2
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Appendix A. Examples related to fragment identifier interoperability

A.1. Unreferenceable nodes

In this example, a couple of YAML nodes that cannot be referenced based on the JSON data model since their mapping keys are not strings.

%YAML 1.2
---
a-map-cannot:
  ? {be: expressed}
  : with a JSON Pointer

0: no numeric mapping keys in JSON

Figure 5: Example of YAML nodes that are not referenceable based on JSON data model.

A.2. Referencing a missing node

In this example the fragment #/0 does not reference an existing node

0: "JSON Pointer '#/0' references a string mapping key."

Figure 6: Example of a JSON Pointer that does not reference an existing node.

A.3. Representation graph with anchors and cyclic references

In this YAML document, the #/foo/bar/baz fragment identifier traverses the representation graph and references the string you. Moreover, the presence of a cyclic reference implies that there are infinite fragment identifiers #/foo/bat/../bat/bar referencing the &anchor node.

anchor: &anchor
  baz: you
foo: &foo
  bar: *anchor
  bat: *foo

Figure 7: Example of a cyclic references and alias nodes.
Many YAML implementations will resolve the merge key "<<:" (https://yaml.org/type/merge.html) defined in YAML 1.1 in the representation graph. This means that the fragment `#/book/author/` given_name references the string Federico and that the fragment `#/book/<<` will not reference any existing node.

```
%YAML 1.1
---
# Many implementations use merge keys.
the-viceroys: &the-viceroys
  title: The Viceroys
  author:
    given_name: Federico
    family_name: De Roberto
  book:
    <<: *the-viceroys
    title: The Illusion
```

Figure 8: Example of YAML merge keys.
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Abstract

HTTP clients rarely make use of the Date header field when making requests. This document describes considerations for using the Date header field in requests. A method is described for correcting erroneous in Date request header fields that might arise from differences in client and server clocks. The risks of applying that correction technique are discussed.

About This Document

This note is to be removed before publishing as an RFC.
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Discussion of this document takes place on the Building Blocks for HTTP APIs Working Group mailing list (mailto:httpapi@ietf.org), which is archived at https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/browse/httpapi/.

Source for this draft and an issue tracker can be found at https://github.com/martinthomson/http-request-date.

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/.
Many HTTP requests are timeless. That is, the contents of the request are not bound to a specific point in time. Thus, the use of the HTTP Date header field in requests is rare; see Section 6.6.1 of [HTTP].
However, in some contexts, it is important that a request only be valid over a small period of time. One such context is when requests are signed [SIGN], where including a time in a request might prevent a signed request from being reused at another time. Similarly, some uses of OHTTP [OHTTP] might depend on the same sort of replay protection. It is possible to make anti-replay protections at servers more efficient if requests from either far in the past or into the future can be rejected.

This document describes some considerations for using the Date request header field in Section 3. A new type of problem report [PROBLEM] is defined in Section 4 for use in rejecting requests with a missing or incorrect Date request header field.

Section 5 explores the consequences of using Date header field in requests when client and server clocks do not agree. A method for recovering from differences in clocks is described in Section 5.1. Section 5.2 describes the privacy considerations that apply to this technique.

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.

3. Date in HTTP Requests

Most HTTP clients have no need to use the Date header field in requests. This only changes if it is important that the request not be considered valid at another time. As requests are - by default - trivially copied, stored, and modified by any entity that can read them, the addition of a Date header field is unlikely to be useful in many cases.

Signed HTTP requests are one example of where requests might be available to entities that are not permitted to alter their contents. Adding a Date request header field - and signing it - ensures that the request cannot be used at a very different time to what was intended.
OHTTP [OHTTP] is another example of where capture and replay of a request might be undesirable. Here, a partially trusted intermediary, an oblivious proxy resource, receives encapsulated HTTP requests. Though this entity cannot read or modify these messages, it is able to delay or replay them. The inclusion of a Date header field in these requests might be used to limit the time over which delay or replay is possible.

In both cases, the inclusion of a Date request header field might be part of an anti-replay strategy at a server. A simple anti-replay scheme starts by choosing a window of time anchored at the current time. Requests with timestamps that fall within this period are remembered and rejected if they appear again; requests with timestamps outside of this window are rejected. This scheme works for any monotonic value (see for example Section 3.4.3 of [RFC4303]) and allows for efficient rejection of duplicate requests with minimal state.

4. Date Not Acceptable Problem Type

A server can send a 400-series status code in response to a request where the Date request header field is either absent or indicates a time that is not acceptable to the server. Including content of type "application/problem+json" (or "application/problem+xml"), as defined in [PROBLEM], in that response allows the server to provide more information about the error.

This document defines a problem type of "https://iana.org/assignments/http-problem-types#date" for indicating that the Date request header field is missing or incorrect. Figure 1 shows an example response in HTTP/1.1 format.

HTTP/1.1 400 Bad Request
Date: Mon, 07 Feb 2022 00:28:05 GMT
Content-Type: application/problem+json
Content-Length: 128

{"type":"https://iana.org/assignments/http-problem-types#date",
"title": "date field in request outside of acceptable range"}

Figure 1: Example Response

A server MUST include a Date response header field in any responses that use this problem detail type.

In processing a Date header field in a request, a server MUST allow for delays in transmitting the request, retransmissions performed by transport protocols, plus any processing that might occur in the
client and any intermediaries, and those parts of the server prior to processing the field. Additionally, the Date header field is only capable of expressing time with a resolution of one second. These factors could mean that the value a server receives could be some time in the past.

Differences between client and server clocks are likely to be a source of most disagreements between the server time and the time expressed in Date request header field. Section 5 will explore this problem in more detail and offer some means of handling these disagreements.

5. Clock Skew

Perfect synchronization of client and server clocks is an ideal state that generally only exists in tightly controlled settings. In practice, despite good availability of time services like NTP [NTP], Internet-connected endpoints often disagree about the time (see for example Section 7.1 of [CLOCKSKEW]).

The prevalence of clock skew could justify servers being more tolerant of a larger range of values for the Date request header field. This includes accepting times that are a short duration into the future in addition to times in the past.

For a server that uses the Date request header field to limit the state kept for anti-replay purposes, the amount of state might be all that determines the range of values it accepts.

5.1. Date Correction

Even when a server is tolerant of small clock errors, a valid request from a client can be rejected if the client clock is outside of the range of times that a server will accept. A server might also reject a request when the client makes a request without a Date header field.

A client can recover from a failure that caused by a bad clock by adjusting the time and re-attempting the request.

For a fresh response (see Section 4.2 of [CACHING]), the client can re-attempt the request, copying the Date header field from the response into its new request. If the response is stale, the client can add the age of the response to determine the time to use in a re-attempt; see Section 5.3 for more.
In addition to adjusting for response age, the client can adjust the time it uses based on the elapsed time since it estimates when the response was generated. Note however that if the client retries a request immediately, any additional increment is likely to be less than the one second resolution of the Date header field under most network conditions.

5.2. Limitations of Date Correction

Clients MUST NOT accept the time provided by an arbitrary HTTP server as the basis for system-wide time. Even if the client code in question were able to set the time, altering the system clock in this way exposes clients to attack. The source of system time information needs to be trustworthy as the current time is a critical input to security-relevant decisions, such as whether to accept a server certificate [RFC6125].

Use of date correction allows requests that use the correction to be correlated. Limitations on use of date corrections is necessary to ensure privacy. An immediate retry of an identical request with an update Date header field is safe in that it only provides the server with the ability to match the retry to the original request.

Anything other than an immediate retry requires careful consideration of the privacy implications. Use of the same date correction for other requests can be used to link those requests to the same client. Using the same date correction is equivalent to connection reuse, cookies, TLS session tickets, or other state a client might carry between requests. Linking requests might be acceptable, but in general only where other forms of linkage already exist.

Clients MUST NOT use the time correction from one server when making requests of another server. Using the same date correction across different servers might be used by servers to link client identities and to exchange information via a channel provided by the client.

For clients that maintain per-server state, the specific date correction that is used for each server MUST be cleared when removing other state for that server to prevent re-identification. For instance, a web browser that remembers a date correction would forget that correction when removing cookies and other state.
5.3. Intermediaries and Date Corrections

Some intermediaries, in particular those acting as reverse proxies or gateways, will rewrite the Date header field in responses. This applies especially to responses served from cache, but this might also apply to those that are forwarded directly from an origin server.

For responses that are forwarded by an intermediary, changes to the Date response header field will not change how the client corrects its clock. Errors only occur if the clock at the intermediary differs significantly from the clock at the origin server or if the intermediary updates the Date response header field without also adjusting or removing the Age header field on a stale response.

Servers that condition their responses on the Date header field SHOULD either ensure that intermediaries do not cache responses (by including a Cache-Control directive of no-store) or designate the response as conditional on the value of the Date request header field (by including the token "date" in a Vary header field).

6. Security Considerations

Including a Date header field in requests reveals information about the client clock. This might be used to identify clients with vulnerability to attacks that depend on incorrect clocks.

Section 5.2 contains a discussion of the security and privacy concerns associated with date correction.

7. IANA Considerations

IANA are requested to create a new entry in the "HTTP Problem Type" registry established by [PROBLEM].

Type URI: https://iana.org/assignments/http-problem-types#date

Title: Date Not Acceptable

Recommended HTTP Status Code: 400

Reference: Section 4 of this document
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