



Network Error Logging: HTTP Archive Analysis

Kamil Jeřábek¹^a and Libor Polčák¹^b

¹*Brno University of Technology, Faculty of Information Technology, Božetěchova 2, 612 66 Brno, Czech Republic
{ijerabek, polcak}@fit.vut.cz*

Keywords: Network Error Logging, HTTP Archive Analysis, Web Server Management

Abstract: Network Error Logging helps web server operators detect operational problems in real-time to provide fast and reliable services. HTTP Archive provides detail information of historical data on HTTP requests. This paper leverages the data and provides a long-term analysis of Network Error Logging deployment. The deployment raised from 0 to 11.73 % (almost 2,250,000 unique domains) since 2019. Current deployment is dominated by Cloudflare. Although we observed different policies, the default settings prevail. Third party collectors emerge raising the diversity needed to gather sound data. Even so, many service deploy self-hosted services. Moreover, we identify potentially malicious adversaries deploy collectors on randomly-generated domains and shortened URLs.

1 INTRODUCTION

Web server operators need to monitor their servers for availability, which is a crucial success factor (Franke, 2012). Network Error Logging (NEL) is a recent World Wide Web Consortium (W3C) proposed standard (W3C, 2021) that allows HTTP servers to employ browsers¹ to report failures in the reachability of web servers, including failures during domain name resolution (Burnett et al., 2020).

Current literature provides only a very shallow data on NEL deployment (Goenka et al., 2022) even though related work identified security and privacy issues in the current NEL implementation (Polčák and Jeřábek, 2023). This paper leverages HTTP archive and analyzes NEL deployment to shed more light on NEL deployment and its trends. NEL deployment is rising, and its share is over 10 %.

This paper is the first to analyze the long-term deployment of NEL. Our analysis shows that:

- Current deployment is dominated by Cloudflare. Consequently, the NEL adoption share strongly depends on future decision of Cloudflare. This


paper highlights Shopify, another NEL large provider, that stopped signalling NEL in 2021.


- Even though the original NEL paper (Burnett et al., 2020) suggests that Google was migrating to NEL, HTTP Archive data does not show any traces of Google deploying NEL.
- We provide data on the NEL policies deployed in the wild and study the NEL ecosystem and the trends inside.
- We identify NEL deployment on domains with strange, possibly randomly generated, names that employ collectors hidden behind a shortened URL.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 explains how NEL works. Section 3 overviews related work. Section 4 describes the methodology and results of the analyses of the HTTP Archive of the NEL deployment. Section 5 discusses the results of this paper. Section 6 concludes this paper.

2 NEL BACKGROUND

NEL was introduced by researchers mostly affiliated with Google (Burnett et al., 2020). The World Wide Web Consortium (W3C) is in the process of standardizing NEL (W3C, 2021). NEL introduces NEL HTTP header sent by an HTTP server that contains the NEL policy of the server. In addition, Report-To HTTP

^a <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5317-9222>

^b <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9177-3073>

¹At the time of the writing of this paper, Chromium-based browsers like Google Chrome, Chrome for Android, Microsoft Edge, Opera, and Opera GF support NEL. Brave is the only Chromium-based browser that we discovered does not support NEL.

header determines web servers that collect NEL reports for the visited domain.

The goal of NEL is to let web server operators instruct their visitors to report failures in attempting to visit the service as well as successful visits. A web server operator can control the fraction of failures (`failure_fraction`) and success reports (`success_fraction`), and other parameters in a NEL policy. The policy is valid for a limited time (`max_age` parameter of a policy). By default, the policy applies to the visited domains, but a server can also instruct the clients to apply the policy to subdomains (`include_subdomains` parameter of a policy).

Figure 1 shows an example of a NEL report. The client reports the age of the error (the browser often sends messages with a delay) and its type. Additionally, the report contains other information about the event so that an operator can react to the message.

```
{
  "age": 0,
  "type": "network-error",
  "url": "https://www.example.com/",
  "body": {
    "sampling_fraction": 0.5,
    "referrer": "http://example.com/",
    "server_ip": "2001:DB8:0:0:0:0:42",
    "protocol": "h2",
    "method": "GET",
    "request_headers": {},
    "response_headers": {},
    "status_code": 200,
    "elapsed_time": 823,
    "phase": "application",
    "type": "http.protocol.error"
  }
}
```

Figure 1: An example of a NEL report (W3C, 2021).

As browsers store only the last policy retrieved for each domain, the HTTP server should install the same policy on all pages on each domain.

3 RELATED WORK

Goenka et al. (Goenka et al., 2022) focused on using dynamic NEL configuration to show how NEL can be used for active measurements critical to CDN operations such as alternate PoP measurements. Besides the main topic, Goenka et al. also briefly analyzed the HTTP Archive. This paper differs as (1) they analyzed only three samples in 2020 whereas this paper covers data between 2018 and 2023, (2) this pa-

per provides deep analysis of the deployed policies not available in their paper, (3) they did not describe the deployment strategies and (4) did not focus on the collector diversity; although they report a rapid increase of reporting URLs, they do not investigate how many domains operate these URLs.

Consequently, this paper provides much deeper analysis from the longitudinal point of view as well as qualitative view.

Jeřábek and Polčák (Polčák and Jeřábek, 2023) studied NEL from the data protection perspective raising serious questions about the legality of NEL deployment in the European Union. Additionally, they explore security issues concerning NEL. The data on the NEL deployment in this paper sheds more light on the seriousness of the issues. To our best knowledge, all other papers concerning NEL utilize NEL as a tool. This paper is the first that systematically monitors the NEL deployment.

4 HTTP ARCHIVE ANALYSIS

This section analysis NEL deployment to learn whether NEL is actively deployed.

4.1 Methodology

HTTP Archive periodically crawls millions of URLs at least once a month and stores information about the fetched resources, including HTTP headers (HTTP Archive, 2022). The crawled data is publicly accessible for analysis via Google Cloud Big Query. HTTP Archive has been crawling the web since November 2011. The data from each crawl is organized in a separate table with a date label. Besides the original HAR logs², HTTP Archive provides summary tables with preprocessed records. A record is a preprocessed HTTP request-response pair. Each page visit during a crawl may include several HTTP requests and responses for additional resources such as JavaScript, CSS, images, or other resources needed for the page load. Hence, a single page visit is stored as multiple records.

We analyzed the summary tables since they contain all the necessary information. We process all records of each page visit. However, we only analyze the first record of each unique domain to remove duplicates since we expect that operators deploy NEL policies consistently.

Moreover, HTTP Archive distinguishes mobile and desktop crawls. Some URLs appear in both

²<https://docs.fileformat.com/web/har/>

crawls. We investigated the overlapping domains and checked that both crawls contain the same NEL policies. Hence, we merged the mobile and desktop records and further analyzed overlapping domains once.

We base our analysis on data from HTTP Archive because it (1) is publicly available, (2) includes HTTP headers, (3) contains historical records, and (4) contains a vast amount of visited websites. To our best knowledge, we are not aware of any better data source providing a comparable amount of data on NEL deployment.

We analyze the data from the 1st February desktop and mobile crawl in each of the last six years (February 2018 to February 2023). We selected the day because a crawl labeled with that day occurs in every examined year for both mobile and desktop. We extracted the data using SQL-like Big Query jobs³ and further processed in Python.

4.2 Results

In 2018, no service deployed NEL as the first implementation of NEL appeared in Chromium at the end of 2018. The adoption raised in the following years. However, the share dropped a little in 2022. Section 5 discusses a possible explanation for the drop. Table 1 contains the number of all domains included in the HTTP Archive, the number and the share of domains that deployed NEL and responded with NEL policy.

Table 1: Unique domains queried within each crawl and those responding with valid NEL headers.

Date	Domains	NEL	NEL [%]
Feb 2018	1022970	0	0
Feb 2019	5707189	355	0.01
Feb 2020	6636205	109483	1.65
Feb 2021	10147089	1004279	9.90
Feb 2022	10363447	960033	9.26
Feb 2023	19159613	2247233	11.73

The analysis below examines only the valid NEL responses. We only consider the domains that deployed NEL. Other domains are not analyzed further. We do not repeat the exact date of the crawls below and refer to each sample by its year only.

Our analysis revealed several known companies and organizations using NEL. Booking.com first deploys NEL in the 2020 records, and Cloudflare first injected NEL headers in the 2021 records. Wikimedia monitors its services like Wikipedia.org and first appears in the 2021 records. Reddit monitors reddit.com and other language mutations in the 2022 and

later records. Microsoft monitors Office365 websites like sharepoint.com in the 2022 and 2023 records. Other companies experiment with NEL. For example, a bank site Raiffeisen.ch signals NEL on domain boerse.Raiffeisen.ch, dell.com signals NEL on dl.dell.com and downloads.dell.com, fastly-insights.com deploys NEL on some subdomains only. Facebook uses NEL on www.beta.facebook.com and reports to www.beta.facebook.com.

4.2.1 NEL Collectors

An operator of a web service may deploy their own NEL collector, or the operator may employ a *NEL collector as a service* (collector hosting) (Burnett et al., 2020). The collector-hosting provider would typically process reports for many domains. Our analyses revealed both collector hosting and private (self-hosted) collectors.

The original paper (Burnett et al., 2020) deems the collector diversity crucial. It favors the services that send NEL reports to a completely different domain to collect NEL reports in more failure scenarios. For example, developer.valvesoftware.net collects NEL at reports.valve.net, www.yandex.com, and various other Yandex domains report to dr.yandex.net and dr2.yandex.net. In contrast, others signal to the same domain name, like fel.cvut.cz and www.stare mesto.sk.

In addition, we analyzed collector URLs and domain names and identified two strategies of NEL collector naming to distinguish the origin. (1) NEL collectors have different subdomain for each origin. An example of such a collector is report-uri.com: domain www.expobeds.com reports to expobeds.report-uri.com, whereas mattferderer.com reports to mattferderer.report-uri.com. (2) All reporting domains share the same NEL collector domain name, and the URL path or parameters encode an identifier to distinguish the reporting domain. An example of such a service is cloudflare.com, which uses 136-characters-long Base64 encoded string identifiers in URL parameters.

To provide fair statistics that are not skewed by the two collector naming strategies, we denote a *NEL collector provider* as a set of NEL collectors with the same second-level domain (SLD). At the beginning of 2019, only 11 (mostly self-hosted) collector providers appeared; the number raised to 147 collectors in 2023, see Table 2.

In 2019, report-uri.com, a collector-hosting service, prevailed. In later years, big CDN providers Shopify and Cloudflare appeared and deployed NEL on the websites they hosted. Both utilize their own NEL collector. Cloudflare’s collector has appeared in the reporting destinations of hundreds of thousands of

³<https://github.com/kjerabek/nel-http-archive-analysis>

Table 2: The count of NEL collector providers, the top four NEL collector providers for each analyzed year, and their share over the analyzed period.

Year	Count	Top 4 providers	Share [%]
2019	11	report-uri.com	87.32
		3gl.net	5.63
		uriports.com	2.54
		seloc.club	1.41
2020	36	shopifycloud.com	98.84
		report-uri.com	0.56
		powerboutique.net	0.23
		fastly-insights.com	0.07
2021	84	cloudflare.com	77.44
		shopifycloud.com	22.26
		wikimedia.org	0.12
		report-uri.com	0.09
2022	115	cloudflare.com	97.72
		cafe24.com	1.79
		wikimedia.org	0.13
		report-uri.com	0.10
2023	147	cloudflare.com	97.91
		cafe24.com	0.94
		freshedge.net	0.34
		office.net	0.33

domains in the 2021 crawl and even increased to almost two million in 2023.

Some collector providers collect NEL reports from a single domain, whereas others are shared between multiple domains, see Table 3. The number of providers shared between many domains is rising. For example, nelreports.net first appeared in 2020, serving 26 domains; it raised to 57 in 2021, 73 in 2022, and 1177 in 2023. Nevertheless, the number of providers employed by a small number of domains also rises significantly.

Table 3: The number of NEL collector providers that are employed by the given number of domains.

Domains	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
1	3	16	48	52	74
2	4	4	8	18	19
3–10	2	4	11	20	26
11–100	1	9	11	15	11
101–1K	1	2	3	7	9
More	0	1	3	3	8

4.2.2 NEL Policy Settings

We analyzed the NEL policies in HTTP Archive dataset and studied `failure_fraction`, `success_fraction`, `include_subdomains`, and `max_age` that appear in the wild.

In the beginning, several different values appeared in `failure_fraction` policies, which reflects the early adoption and possibly experimentation with the newly introduced technology. In 2020, the values were set to report mostly a small share of errors (10 % in 99 % of cases). However, since 2021 almost all operators have been interested in all errors, which is the default. Only one domain in 2020 was not interested in failures at all. The desire to collect failures is understandable, as failure detection is the main motivation behind NEL. Even so, 21,606 domains collect only 10 % of the failures, and 5,429 domains collect 5 % of the failures or less (in 2023). Table 4 shows the settings observed each year.

Table 4: Observed failure fraction values. The symbol \updownarrow denotes an open interval of values between range values on the row above and below.

Value	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
0	0	1	0	0	0
\updownarrow	224	297	363	458	3761
0.01	1	108K	78	107	137
\updownarrow	0	0	0	1	5
0.05	0	4	1269	1328	1526
\updownarrow	0	0	0	0	0
0.1	3	266	167	17K	22K
\updownarrow	0	2	3	19	78
0.25	0	0	5	6	8
\updownarrow	0	0	0	0	2
0.5	2	3	3	9	72
\updownarrow	1	0	0	9	6
1	124	673	1.0M	941K	2.2M

Regarding `success_fraction`, we typically observed ranges from 0.0 to 0.01, as shown in Table 5. The default value of 0.0 dominates in all years except for 2020 where the servers injected the policy of 0.001 in most cases. Although most servers limit the number of success reports, in the 2020 and later crawls, at least two domains are interested in all success reports in each analyzed year.

As NEL policies are not applied to subdomains by default, operators need to intentionally change the policy to include subdomains. The non-default setting prevailed only in the first year of the NEL deployment. Later, the policies apply to subdomains in about or less than 1% of cases. Table 6 shows the precise distribution in all years.

The expiration policy, set by `max_age`, ranges from seconds to years since the maximal value is not limited. Nevertheless, the most common values occurring are hours, 1 day, 7 days, and 30 days. Hundreds of domains inject policies valid for one year. The maximal value observed was two years, but it appeared only in a few cases. Some servers remov-

Table 5: Observed success fraction values. The symbol \updownarrow denotes an open interval of values between range values on the row above and below.

Value	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
0	350	1156	780K	907K	1.6M
\updownarrow	1	108K	224K	805	9267
0.01	2	1	19	51K	620K
\updownarrow	0	0	0	0	3
0.05	0	14	7	21	41
\updownarrow	0	0	0	0	0
0.1	0	0	2	3	8
\updownarrow	0	0	0	9	509
0.25	2	2	3	0	0
\updownarrow	0	0	0	0	0
0.5	0	0	0	0	4
\updownarrow	0	0	0	0	0
1	0	2	6	4	19

Table 6: The share of NEL-signalling servers with `include_subdomains` set to true.

Year	true [%]
2019	98.03
2020	1.02
2021	0.14
2022	0.17
2023	0.63

ing NEL policies with `max_age=0` appeared each year. Table 7 shows the distribution of `max_age` values in each year.

Table 7: Observed `max_age` values. The symbol \updownarrow denotes an open interval of values between range values on the row above and below; *ds* stands for days.

Value	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
0	1	5	9	6	7
\updownarrow	3	42	207	318	3645
1 hour	228	302	466	1177	840
\updownarrow	0	333	0	78	7485
1 day	5	50	1490	1562	2866
\updownarrow	1	0	0	7	54
7 ds	3	62	778K	939K	2.2M
\updownarrow	2	68	76	94	87
30 ds	29	108K	224K	18K	30K
\updownarrow	4	10	63	21	32
365 ds	79	234	486	489	881
\updownarrow	0	2	2	8	9
730 ds	0	1	1	1	2

5 DISCUSSION

This section discusses the results and limitations of this paper.

5.1 Observations From the HTTP Archive Analysis

Since 2020 the default policy values have prevailed. However, non-default values also appear in the data set. We observed values for each variable across its validity range. The NEL deployment of Cloudflare causes the uniformity of the observed values. We observed only two policies that send data to the NEL collector of Cloudflare that differ in `success_fraction` only.

We suspect that Shopify stopped signaling NEL headers during 2021 and we observed the drop in NEL share in 2022. In 2023, over 97 % of NEL deployment is controlled by a single entity — Cloudflare. Hence, the observed 11.73 % share of NEL deployment strongly depends on Cloudflare adoption. Should Cloudflare remove NEL, NEL deployment share would dwindle.

We did not find any traces of Google’s NEL deployment. Even when we manually visited Google domains, we did not see NEL headers. The original NEL paper (Burnett et al., 2020) mentions two implementations. One is called *Domain Reliability* and was hard-coded in Chrome since 2014 (version 38). The other is based on HTTP headers, as studied in this paper. The original NEL paper (Burnett et al., 2020) claims that Google was migrating from Domain Reliability to NEL. However, we have not observed Google sending NEL headers; it looks like Google never deployed NEL based on HTTP headers. Another explanation is that Google signals NEL headers only to a fraction of visitors, and neither our manual attempts nor the crawls of HTTP Archive triggered the injection.

In the last two years’ records, we have encountered a few cases of randomly generated domains, like `gkju.org` and `embeumkm.com`. These domains were injecting NEL policies with the reporting destination set to shortened URLs hosted by `bit.ly`. The policy setting used default values, except it included subdomains and lasted one year. Such an approach demonstrates how malicious actors can misuse NEL to monitor their deployed services while hiding their NEL collectors, as it is impossible to retroactively learn the true identity of these collectors from HTTP Archive.

5.2 Limitations of this study

During the HTTP Archive analyses, we focused on the first response of each domain. We did not analyze if the NEL header setting is consistent within a domain. As HTTP Archive focuses on main pages and pages linked from the main page (HTTP Archive,

2022), only a minority of resources are crawled on most domains. Hence, a sound analysis of the consistency of the NEL policies is not possible based on HTTP Archive. For these reasons and because HTTP Archive does not crawl data from various locations, we cannot confirm if NEL leaks data to third parties in practice.

The original NEL paper (Burnett et al., 2020) recommends hosting collectors in multiple physical and network (logical) locations. However, data concerning physical and network locations are not available in the HTTP Archive. Consequently, Section 4 does not study some characteristics of NEL deployment, like collector diversity. Further work can amend Section 4 with a study of additional aspects of NEL deployment.

A limitation of the study of NEL collectors (subsection 4.2.1) is that we classify NEL collectors according to the second-level domain rather than the effective TLD+1. Consequently, we aggregate all collectors in co.uk and co.th domains (both domains have two collectors). Additionally, we aggregate tenants of some cloud providers like Amazon AWS (amazonaws.com). We accepted the limitation because (1) the number of collectors in the TLDs without the possibility to register second level is tiny so the results are not significantly affected and (2) it is not clear where to draw the line (should the Amazon AWS tenants be counted separately or together; in the former case, what other services should be treated similarly?).

6 CONCLUSION

Error monitoring is a crucial activity of web server operators. Even though Chromium-based browsers have supported NEL for several years, NEL deployment was not systematically studied. Our paper studies the current NEL deployment and revealed that NEL is dominated by Cloudflare. Its customers employ one of two policies. Nevertheless, we observe other important players that deployed NEL or experiment with the deployment.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported by the Brno University of Technology grant Smart information technology for a resilient society (FIT-S-23-8209).

REFERENCES

- Burnett, S., Chen, L., Creager, D. A., Efimov, M., Grigorik, I., Jones, B., Madhyastha, H. V., Papageorge, P., Rogan, B., Stahl, C., and Tuttle, J. (2020). Network error logging: Client-side measurement of end-to-end web service reliability. In *17th USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation, NSDI 2020*, pages 985–998. USENIX Association.
- Franke, U. (2012). Optimal IT service availability: Shorter outages, or fewer? *IEEE Transactions on Network and Service Management*, 9(1):22–33.
- Goenka, P., Zarifis, K., Gupta, A., and Calder, M. (2022). Towards client-side active measurements without application control. *SIGCOMM Comput. Commun. Rev.*, 52(1):20–27.
- HTTP Archive (2022). Methodology — The Web Almanac by HTTP Archive. <https://almanac.httparchive.org/en/2022/methodology>.
- Polčák, L. and Jeřábek, K. (2023). Data protection and security issues with network error logging.
- W3C (2021). Network error logging. The World Wide Web Consortium (W3C) internal document, <https://w3c.github.io/network-error-logging/>, Editor’s Draft of 30th July 2021.