

Checking Resource Consistency with HTTP Mirrors

Benjamin Beurdouche, Matthew Finkel, Tommy Pauly, **Steven Valdez**, Chris Wood

IETF 119 - PRIVACYPASS - 2024-03

Agenda

- Open Issues
- Client Fetching Patterns/Authenticity
- Next Steps

Binary HTTP? ([#25](#))

- Draft uses Binary HTTP (RFC 9292) for the content, to encapsulate the entire target resource response in a binary format for the client to check
- Issue suggests that we should only be validating the content of the resource, and some specific header fields (like content type) rather than the entire response
- Do we need to be checking anything other header fields with the mirror?

Config rotation ([#31](#))

- If a mirror is caching the resource across responses, its cache might be behind a recently-rotated resource that the client now has
- How should clients handle inconsistency when the mirror and the resource are temporarily out of sync? Are clients responsible for retrying?
- Should clients be able to tell mirrors to refresh their view?

Thundering herd at expiration ([#8](#))

- If a resource expires and all clients get a new copy, they can create a “thundering herd” to the mirror when they all need to check consistency again
- Mitigations:
 - Only check the mirror on-demand for infrequently used resources
 - “Ladder” strategy, where clients get multiple versions of the resource – i.e., the current key and the next key, so they can delay updating

Client IP leakage ([#15](#))

- If clients directly access a mirror, the mirror can see the client IPs and log the pool of IPs seen
- One mitigation is to spread mirror requests out among a larger set of mirrors

Client Fetching Patterns/Authenticity ([#27](#))

- Brought up on adoption call.
- Currently the document doesn't call out that the consistency fetch only establishes consistency and not authenticity.
- Some applications should require an additional direct fetch.
- Other applications (privacypass) may be able to rely on the content being provided through other parts of the protocol.
- Potential Resolutions:
 - Default behavior of the draft requires a “direct fetch”?
 - Addition to security considerations that this doesn't resolve authenticity and allow per-application.

Other Issues

- Consistency/Lifetime Clarifications
 - #5 - Consistency at end of key validity.
 - #26 - Cache lifetime on mirrored resources.
 - #28 - Consistency period
- Batch/Multiple Resource Fetching
 - #7 - Batched fetching
 - #33 - All valid keys
- #23 - Freshness vs Age
- #29 - Defection probability
- #32 - Content negotiation
- #34 - Mention CORS

Next Steps

- Resolve open issues based on this discussion.
- Other comments
 - Consistency endpoint could provide hashes/digest instead.
 - Question about interest in a push-based/polling-based model.
- Implementations?