

# Unencoded Digest

[draft-ietf-httpbis-unencoded-digest](#)

IETF 123 HTTPbis 2025-07

# Antics with semantics

```
GET /boringstring HTTP/1.1  
Host: example.org  
Accept-Encoding: gzip
```



"We're really more of a department."

# Antics with semantics

```
GET /boringstring HTTP/1.1
Host: example.org
Accept-Encoding: gzip
```



"We're really more of a department."

Digest of the response message content  
**with gzip**

```
HTTP/1.1 200 OK
Content-Encoding: gzip
Repr-Digest: sha-256=:XyjvEuFb1P5rqc2le3vQm7M96DwZhvmOwqHLu2xVpY4=:
Unencoded-Digest: sha-256=:5Bv3NIx05BPnh0jMph6v1RJ5Q7kl9LKMtQxmvc9+Z7Y=:
```

```
<content>
```

Digest of the response message content  
**without gzip**

# Antics with semantics

```
HEAD /boringstring HTTP/1.1
Host: example.org
Accept-Encoding: gzip
```



Digest of the representation  
with gzip

```
HTTP/1.1 200 OK
Content-Encoding: gzip
Repr-Digest: sha-256=:XyjvEuFb1P5rqc21e3vQm7M96DwZhvmOwqHLu2xVpY4=:
Unencoded-Digest: sha-256=:5Bv3NIx05BPnh0jMph6v1RJ5Q7kl9LKMtQxmvc9+Z7Y=:
```

Digest of the representation  
without gzip

# Updates since adoption

- Published 01 with one change - parameters ([PR #3132](#))
- Stumbled over while writing tests in chrome
- Fix - add text:

Each Dictionary value can have zero or more Parameters (Section 3.1.2 of STRUCTURED-FIELDS). This specification does not define any Parameters but extensions MAY define them. Unknown Parameters MUST be ignored.

# Parameters example

```
GET /boringstring HTTP/1.1  
Host: example.org  
Accept-Encoding: gzip
```

```
HTTP/1.1 200 OK  
Content-Encoding: gzip  
Unencoded-Digest: sha-256=:5Bv3NIx05BPnh0jMph6v1RJ5Q7k19LKMtQxmvc9+Z7Y=:  
;future-extension=xyz
```

```
<content>
```

Digest of the response message content  
**without** gzip. Including a parameter



# We overlooked this for Content-Digest & Repr-Digest

Oops!

Structured Fields [Section 2.3](#) says:

*Structured Fields are designed to be extensible because experience has shown that, even when it is not foreseen, it is often necessary to modify and add to the allowable syntax and semantics of a field in a controlled fashion.*

*Both Items and Inner Lists allow Parameters as an extensibility mechanism; this means that their values can later be extended to accommodate more information, if need be. To preserve forward compatibility, field specifications are discouraged from defining the presence of an unrecognized parameter as an error condition.*

So what to do?

# Fixing the mess?

Some possible options:

1. Do nothing more
  - a. Content-Digest / Repr-Digest say nothing. Unencoded-Digest says something
2. File erratum on RFC 9530
  - a. Seems like it would end up as a hold for update
3. Formally update RFC 9530 in this draft
  - a. Add some text that states those older headers have the same parameter extensibility rules/expectations
4. <Your idea here?

# Closing thoughts

No more open issues

Some implementation work

Anyone else interested?

We're done?