

# An implementation of HTTP /HTTPS and SSL for Scheme 48

Harald Glab-Plhak <[hglabplhak@icloud.com](mailto:hglabplhak@icloud.com)>

October 6, 2025

## Contents

|          |  |          |
|----------|--|----------|
| <b>1</b> | <b>Abstract</b>  | <b>2</b> |
| <b>2</b> | <b>Introduction</b>  | <b>2</b> |
| 2.1      | The Sockets implementations . . . . .  | 2        |
| 2.2      | Issues for the project . . . . .   | 2        |
| 2.3      | The procedural interface . . . . .   | 3        |
| 2.4      | Procedural Interface for Sockets . . . . .   | 3        |
| 2.5      | Procedural Interface for HTTP/ HTTPS . . . . .   | 3        |
| 2.6      | The DSL definition as interface . . . . .  | 3        |
| 2.7      | The SSL syntactic layer . . . . .  | 3        |
| 2.8      | The HTTP / HTTPS syntactic layer . . . . .   | 3        |
| <b>3</b> | <b>Proof of concept based on HTTP-EASY and its dependencies written in racket</b>                        | <b>3</b> |
| <b>4</b> | <b>Procedural interface definitions</b>  | <b>3</b> |
| 4.1      | The SSL/TLS procedural interface in C / Scheme . . . . .   | 4        |
| 4.1.1    | The SSL / TLS procedural interface which is based on <i>LibreSSL</i> is structured as follows: . . . . . | 4        |
| 4.2      | The HTTP/HTTPS Common functionality . . . . .  | 4        |
| 4.3      | The HTTP/HTTPS procedural interface in Scheme (Part for all three versions) . . . . .                    | 4        |
| 4.4      | HTTP/1.1 specific implementation // procedural . . . . .   | 4        |
| 4.5      | The HTTP/2 specific implementation // procedural . . . . .   | 4        |
| 4.6      | The header compression for HTTP/2(HPAC) . . . . .  | 4        |
| 4.7      | The HTTP/3 specific implementation // procedural . . . . .   | 4        |
| 4.8      | The QUIC protocol implementation . . . . .   | 4        |
| 4.9      | The header compression for HTTP/3(QPAC) . . . . .  | 4        |
| 4.10     | The HTTP Method definition and the resource(input) definition . . . . .                                  | 4        |
| 4.11     | Multipart attachements . . . . .   | 4        |
| 4.12     | RESTful service layer over HTTP . . . . .  | 4        |
| <b>5</b> | <b>DSL like interface definitions with syntax definitions</b>  | <b>4</b> |
| <b>6</b> | <b>APPENDIX A: Technical Expressions and used Standards Explained in short</b>                           | <b>5</b> |
| 6.1      | The HTTP 1.1 / 2 / 3 Protocol . . . . .  | 5        |
| 6.2      | Why a complete change in the versions is neccesary . . . . .   | 5        |
| 6.3      | The HTTP/2 and HTTP/3 protocols . . . . .  | 5        |
| <b>7</b> | <b>Appendix B: Tables and Graphics</b>   | <b>5</b> |
| <b>8</b> | <b>References</b>  | <b>6</b> |

# 1 Abstract

What we like to do is to support *SSL / HTTP / HTTPS* in Scheme 48. The interface for that will be implemented nearly implemented as Domain Specific Language for Networking. I will use *LibreSSL* as external library to avoid errors and bugs in the implementation by doing that on my own with much less time than the developers and designers this components have due to much more manpower. The goal is to implement the *HTTP / 1.1* and *HTTP/2* and *HTTP/3* as well. To get something like a pseudo standard, the interface is inspired by the *HTTP-EASY* library written in *Racket Language* and is a free style. port of it (we use the codebase and transfer it to real scheme and make it fit to S48) [HTTP-EASY \(Lib Site\)](#) which is implemented in racket which is also inspired by scheme and which also has an *R6RS* Scheme standard implemented. The implementation and interface is committed to the requirements defined by the *RFC Documents* linked in [References](#).

In addition to the client library a full functional toolkit will be implemented for developing application containers with *RESTful*<sup>1</sup> interfaces (e.g. using *YAML* definitions) or at last my be application containers and something like *OCSP*<sup>2</sup> Services. This will be really enough for the first step.

## 2 Introduction

Scheme 48 is a SCHEME interpreter actually following the R5RS standard but the R6RS is nearly ready for delivery. In this implementation up to now there is a net component implementing socket communication. The first step to reach our goal will be to introduce a SSL capable implementation using the current implementation for port and channel handling to get an appropriate layer definition for implementing the things for HTTP / HTTPS.

Short explanation of the Plain Socket / SSL Layer: For the SSL Layer we built up a little syntax with `define-syntax`, which is a `define` for a new generic usable function definition which

contains the protocol definition, the CTX the Certificate and the connection parameters in a record after that this command executes a handshake and open connection in a way that we get a port number which can be used either by LibreSSL or by the native C socket API to do HTTP / HTTPS. Short explanation of the HTTP / HTTPS Layer: The HTTPS layer is defined on top of the SSL Layer by the next `define-syntax`.

### 2.1 The Sockets implementations

First of all we have to design our interface and the syntax and attributes and functional syntactic layout of our tiny DSL. After that it is necessary to build the low level functionality in C so that we can then build our things in scheme. I prefer this way because it is good to see an early success so that the work is not too long before knowing that the concept works. The first part that we develop of course. also as a base for the DSL is a procedural interface (function calls).

### 2.2 Issues for the project

Here are some issues which are important for our task:

- How read / write is planned
  - Using the new. Port / Channel I/O written for R6RS
  - Make it stable for multi-threading via atomically
- We use some kind of pseudo code to describe the logic here
  - Using the My Lisp dialect / McCarthy Lisp dialect and formula
- Additional things which we will implement
  - Implement URL encoding
  - Basic and Certificate AUTH Headers
  - Implement base for RESTful services including yaml like definition and JSON support
  - Implement MULTIPart attachemenzs with MIME spec.

<sup>1</sup>*REST Requests*: The *RepresEntational abbrhighcolState abbrhighcolTransfer* API is an architectural style and the RESTful services follows this specification to design a special form of HTTP requests.

<sup>2</sup>*OCSP*: The *Open Certificate Service Protocol* is used to implement servers being requested using OCSP Requests and defined OCSP Responses for checking the correctness and the validity of a certificate.

## 2.3 The procedural interface

The procedural interface is the interface where several functions are defined for each layer. This interface can be used in a very flexible way. This part is the positive thing about this part of implementation. The negative effect of this part of interface is that the function have to be used in the right way and order. In cause of that we define also a DSL which ensures the usage of the functions in the right way. This part will be described. later. For getting a clear architecture the implementations are divided in a low-level interface on which the high level interface (The recommended interface) is built as layer with more simple. and straight arguments not needing too much technical details for better understanding by the people using the library.

## 2.4 Procedural Interface for Sockets

The interface for defining Sockets is build by using the C-Socket API and for the Secure Socket Layer and Transport Security Layer LibreSSL is used. Th functions we need are called in a Scheme48 FFI Module. The FFI is the Foreign Function Interface. With this interface the functions can be called and S48 values can be returned which we use after defining this layer in the pure scheme part.

## 2.5 Procedural Interface for HTTP/HTTPS

In this part of the procedural interface the HTTP / HTTPS protocols are implemented V1.1 the older nearly outdated format although it is widely used up to now. The V 2.0 with HPAC<sup>3</sup> and V 3.0 with QPAC<sup>4</sup>.

## 2.6 The DSL definition as interface

The DSL<sup>5</sup> for the SSL Layer itself will be designed by using the define-syntax and the other hygienic macro functionality.

A Domain specific language has to be defined in a way that the Function / Keywords can be used inside the definition of the syntax for the DSL

<sup>3</sup>**HPAC**: Header Compression for HTTP/2

<sup>4</sup>**QPAC**: Header Compression for HTTP/3

<sup>5</sup>**DSL**: A **D**omain **S**pecific **L**anguage is a language normally built up in the host language. A DSL is designed for special tasks and areas e.g.: Windowing.

## 2.7 The SSL syntactic layer

At first we need a syntax to declare a Socket **Plain/SSL**. Here we have to think about connection parameters and about parameters and attributes for **SSL / TLS** (e.g. **CTX** and certificate keys and a specific Algorithm for transport. The **CTX** will be a structure/record-type as well as the definition of the base connection parameters.

## 2.8 The HTTP / HTTPS syntactic layer

In this layer a grammar is defined to have a save way to create **HTTP (GET, PUT, POST, DELETE, HEAD....)** Requests and to define the request data in the same step. With the created 'object' a send can be done. The same is done for the server side receive the other way round. There is also a grammar defined for sending the HTTP / HTTPS request to the server. and to handle / give back the response.

# 3 Proof of concept based on HTTP-EASY and its dependencies written in racket

For the first implementation of the QUIC protocol and HTTP/3 with QPAC as well as full support of HTTP/2 with HPAC we choose the project [HTTP-EASY \(Lib Site\)](#). The main reason is that we can test in the fork of the implementation how much effort it will take to implement HPAC QPAC QUIC HTTP/2 and HTTP/3 in a nearly pure functional way without using native C libraries.

As pool for ideas doing this we use the Haskell project simply called quic. [QUIC - Haskell](#) and msquic [MS QUIC Implementation](#) (The links here are of my forked versions of the original projects).

# 4 Procedural interface definitions

First we design and implement the procedural interface. In this interface we define functions for the different tasks. The parameters and the returns are designed in a way that the functions

are doing a create of the request, a connection establishment and the send .... for each task there are one or more functions. Of course the functions differ if the use either a secure or a non secure connection and transmission. For using that interface a deeper technical know how as in the syntactic layer about all these things and the possibilities is necessary. And now finally let's dive into it more detailed.

#### 4.1 The SSL/TLS procedural interface in C / Scheme

##### 4.1.1 The SSL / TLS procedural interface which is based on *LibreSSL* is structured as follows:

At first we have a layer which wraps the LibreSSL functions with an interface definition according to the FFI for C in Scheme 48.

The first functions we need are that to initialise a socket with SSL / TLS attributes and the right context to establish a secure socket connection via TCP/IP the connection for the QUIC (HTTP/3) is done in a separate task and with separate code. After having the code for the initialisation and the connect we have to develop the functions for open -> read / write -> close / finish (free socket).

This functions are written (except the finishing) in pure Scheme by using the existing port I/O in Scheme 48.

#### 4.2 The HTTP/HTTPS Common functionality

#### 4.3 The HTTP/HTTPS procedural interface in Scheme (Part for all three versions)

#### 4.4 HTTP/1.1 specific implementation // procedural

#### 4.5 The HTTP/2 specific implementation // procedural

#### 4.6 The header compression for HTTP/2(HPAC)

#### 4.7 The HTTP/3 specific implementation // procedural

#### 4.8 The QUIC protocol implementation

#### 4.9 The header compression for HTTP/3(QPAC)

#### 4.10 The HTTP Method definition and the resource(input) definition

#### 4.11 Multipart attachements

#### 4.12 RESTful service layer over HTTP

### 5 DSL like interface definitions with syntax definitions

---

<sup>6</sup>*HTTP*: The *H*yper *T*ext *T*ransport *P*rotocol used for transport e.g. *HTML* or designing *REST Requests* . The protocol is implemented by all Web Browsers and is used all over the internet to transport / requesting and servicing data in a structured form with defined requests like *GET*, *PUT*, *DELETE*, *HEAD* .... All of these requests have a defined response format.

## 6 APPENDIX A: Technical Expressions and used Standards Explained in short

### 6.1 The HTTP 1.1 / 2 / 3 Protocol

The HTTP<sup>6</sup> was developed for transport of data over TCP/IP in a well defined structured way. The HTTP 1.1 protocol was and is widely used for a long time. After this the HTTP 2.0 protocol was developed containing many new features and optimizing especially in compressing header information via HPAC to lower the amount of data transported per each request. With the HTTP/3 now a new way is established with a protocol not based on TCP/IP but on a protocol called QUIC which is built on top of UDP.

### 6.2 Why a complete change in the versions is necessary

Over the decades the internet and how it is used changed dramatically. In the beginning there were maybe a few millions of users now we talk about a user count of millions \* 100 or more. The other important change is the amount of data consumed, by one user climbed higher exponentially. This leads at the one hand to the need of more and more servers and since hardware and its power is a not endless resource new protocols are needed to get the goal. UDP and TCP are very 'old' they both have many advantages as well as disadvantages. So we had to pack HTTP Header data at first with HPAC and after that a new protocol (in the first version invented by Google Inc. takes place and is based on the much faster UDP but with many

enhancements. HTTP/3 uses this protocol with QPAC which has advantages regarding blocking states over HPAC. And now let us have a look on the protocols.

### 6.3 The HTTP/2 and HTTP/3 protocols

The *HTTP/2 protocol* is built on top of the *TCP/IP protocol* while the *HTTP/3 protocol* is built on top of the *QUIC protocol*. To understand what this means and to understand the difference we will have a closer look on both protocols (For a short overview see: [Table 1](#)):

- **The TCP protocol:**<sup>7</sup> The Transmission Control Protocol is the most widely used protocol in the internet today. The advantage is that it is a secure protocol regarding the situation that packages can be lost. A package loss is for sure detected by the peer and is handled correctly. One of the disadvantages is the high cost for connection establishment (there is a high amount of overhead) and the high cost of opening a connection and doing a handshake with the peer. The protocol supports all versions of SSL/TLS. Since this protocol is used so often the internet data transmission layer is labeled as "TCP / IP" although there exists also a "UDP / IP".
- **The UDP protocol:**<sup>8</sup> The User Datagram Protocol
- **The QUIC protocol:**<sup>9</sup> This protocol based on UDP is built using and varying the base UDP protocol implementation

## 7 Appendix B: Tables and Graphics

| <i>TCP</i>                   | <i>UDP</i>            |
|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Connection Oriented          | W / O Connection      |
| Reliable                     | Unreliable            |
| Defined package order        | Unclear package order |
| Redo in case of package loss | Package loss ignored  |

Table 1: *TCP vs. UDP*

<sup>7</sup> *TCP*: Transmission Control Protocol

<sup>8</sup> *UDP*: User Datagram Protocol

<sup>9</sup> *QUIC protocol*: Quick UDP Internet Connection

| <i>UDP</i>   | <i>QUIC</i>  |
|--|--|
| W / O Connection and stateless<br>peer waits for packages                                  | Connection oriented stateful<br>Client / Server connection   |
| The package order is not defined.<br>Applications have to look for<br>the order themselves | The package order is well defined<br>but there is also the possibility<br>. to send packages unordered |
| Package loss is not handled  | Has a Package loss detection<br>and handles a Package loss   |
| nothing for reset a transmission   | a transmission can be resetted   |

Table 2: *Differences between UDP and QUIC which is built on it*

## 8 References

- [RFC-5246 \(TLS V 1.2\)](#)  
The Transport Layer Security (TLS) Protocol  
Version 1.2 Authors: T. Dierks Independent, E.  
Rescorla RTFM, Inc.
- [RFC-8446 \(TLS V 1.3\)](#)  
The Transport Layer Security (TLS) Protocol  
Version 1.3 Author(s): E. Rescorla Mozilla
- [RFC-6101 \(SSL V 3.0\)](#)  
The Secure Socket Layer (SSL) Protocol Version  
3.0 Authors: A. Freier, P. Karlton Netscape  
Communications, P. Kocher Independent  
Consultant
- [RFC-3986 \(URI\)](#)  
The Uniform Resource Identifier (URI) Authors:  
T. Berners-Lee W3C/MIT, R. Fielding Day.  
Software, L. Masinter Adobe Systems
- [RFC-9112 \(HTTP/1.1\)](#)  
The specification of the Hyper Text Transfer  
Protocol / 1.1 ( Authors: R. Fielding, Ed. , M.  
Nottingham, Ed., J. Reschke, Ed. )
- [RFC-9110 \(HTTP Semantics\)](#)  
The semantics specification of the Hyper Text  
Transfer Protocol (Authors: R. Fielding, Ed.,  
M. Nottingham, Ed., J. Reschke, Ed.)
- [RFC-9113 \(HTTP/2\)](#)  
The specification of the Hyper Text Transfer  
Protocol / 2 ( Authors: M. Thomson, Ed. , C.  
Benfield, Ed. )
- [RFC-7541 \(HPAC\)](#)  
HPACK: Field Compression for HTTP/2  
Authors: R. Peon Google Inc., H. Ruellan Canon  
CRF
- [RFC-9114 \(HTTP/3\)](#)  
The specification of the Hyper Text Transfer  
Protocol / 3( Authors: M. Bishop, Ed. )
- [RFC-8999 \(Version Indep. QUIC\)](#)  
Version-Independent Properties of  
QUIC(Authors:M. Thomson Mozilla )
- [RFC-9000 \(QUIC\)](#)  
QUIC: A UDP-Based Multiplexed and Secure  
Transport( Authors: J. Iyengar, Ed. Fastly M.  
Thomson, Ed. Mozilla)
- [RFC-9001 \(TLS 3.0 with QUIC\)](#)  
TLS 3.0 with QUIC: Using TLS to Secure QUIC(  
Authors: M. Thomson, Ed. Mozilla S. Turner,  
Ed. sn3rd)
- [RFC-9002 \(QUIC Loss Detection and  
Congestion Control\)](#)  
QUIC Loss Detection and Congestion Control:  
How to handle data loss collisions....QUIC(  
Authors: J. Iyengar, Ed. FastlyI. Swett, Ed.  
Google)
- [RFC-9204 \(QPAC\)](#) QPACK: Field  
Compression for HTTP/3 (Authors: C. Krasnic,  
M. Bishop Akamai Technologies, A. Frindell,  
Ed.Facebook)
- [QUIC elaborated article on Wikipedia](#)
- [HTTP/3 and QUIC a post written by M.  
Bishop](#)