



Errata to SyncML OBEX Binding

Specification version: 1.0

Specification date: 2000-12-07



SyncML Initiative

The following companies are Sponsors of the SyncML initiative:

Ericsson
IBM
Lotus
Matsushita Communications Industrial Co., Ltd.
Motorola
Nokia
Palm, Inc.
Psion
Starfish Software

Editors:



Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) **Ericsson, IBM, Lotus, Matsushita Communication Industrial Co., LTD, Motorola, Nokia, Palm, Inc., Psion, Starfish Software** (2001).

All Rights Reserved.

Implementation of all or part of any Specification may require licenses under third party intellectual property rights, including without limitation, patent rights (such a third party may or may not be a Supporter). The Sponsors of the Specification are not responsible and shall not be held responsible in any manner for identifying or failing to identify any or all such third party intellectual property rights.

THIS DOCUMENT AND THE INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN ARE PROVIDED ON AN "AS IS" BASIS WITHOUT WARRANTY OF ANY KIND AND ERICSSON, IBM, LOTUS, MATSUSHITA COMMUNICATION INDUSTRIAL CO. LTD, MOTOROLA, NOKIA, PALM INC., PSION, STARFISH SOFTWARE AND ALL OTHER SYNCML SPONSORS DISCLAIM ALL WARRANTIES, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO ANY WARRANTY THAT THE USE OF THE INFORMATION HEREIN WILL NOT INFRINGE ANY RIGHTS OR ANY IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE. IN NO EVENT SHALL ERICSSON, IBM, LOTUS, MATSUSHITA COMMUNICATION INDUSTRIAL CO., LTD, MOTOROLA, NOKIA, PALM INC., PSION, STARFISH SOFTWARE OR ANY OTHER SYNCML SPONSOR BE LIABLE TO ANY PARTY FOR ANY LOSS OF PROFITS, LOSS OF BUSINESS, LOSS OF USE OF DATA, INTERRUPTION OF BUSINESS, OR FOR DIRECT, INDIRECT, SPECIAL OR EXEMPLARY, INCIDENTAL, PUNITIVE OR CONSEQUENTIAL DAMAGES OF ANY KIND IN CONNECTION WITH THIS DOCUMENT OR THE INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN, EVEN IF ADVISED OF THE POSSIBILITY OF SUCH LOSS OR DAMAGE.

The above notice and this paragraph must be included on all copies of this document that are made.



- 1 Formatting Conventions 5**
 - 1.1 Errata Type Classifications 5
- 2 OBEX Client/Server Clarifications 6**
 - 2.1 Problem..... 6
 - 2.2 Solution..... 6
 - 2.2.1 Other specifications/erratas affected..... 6
- 3 SCR for OBEX Binding Correction 6**
 - 3.1 Problem..... 6
 - 3.2 Solution..... 6
 - 3.2.1 Other specifications/erratas affected..... 6
- 4 Diagram clarification 7**
 - 4.1 Problem..... 7
 - 4.2 Solution..... 7
 - 4.2.1 Other specifications/erratas affected..... 7
- 5 Mime type Corrections 7**
 - 5.1 Problem..... 7
 - 5.2 Solution..... 7
 - 5.2.1 Other specifications/erratas affected..... 7
- 6 References 7**



1 Formatting 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 [RFC 2119].

1.1 Errata Type Classifications

The errata types are classified according to the following scheme:

CLARIFICATION: Textual enhancement that provides a clearer explanation of a specification item without changing any behavior.

CORRECTION: A modification that obsoletes some items in the current published specification.

PROBLEM: A known problem for which an erratum has yet to be proposed.



2 OBEX Client/Server Clarifications

2.1 Problem

Better clarification of the terms OBEX Client and OBEX server in conjunction with the SyncML Server and SyncML Client roles.

2.2 Solution

Change the third paragraph of section 3 to say:

In this specification, the SyncML client can work either as an OBEX client or as an OBEX server at the OBEX protocol layer. In consequence, the SyncML server can work either as an OBEX client or as an OBEX server. The OBEX role depends on the fact which one, the SyncML client or the SyncML server, initiates sync. Thus the SyncML Client is not necessarily the OBEX Client.

2.2.1 Other specifications/erratas affected

N/A

3 SCR for OBEX Binding Correction

3.1 Problem

The binding specification does not make clear the OBEX Client and Server requirements for OBEX conformance.

3.2 Solution

Replace the SCR table in section 4.1 to show the table below:

OBEX Operation	SyncML Server		SyncML Client	
	OBEX Client	OBEX Server	OBEX Client	OBEX Server
Connect	MAY	MUST	MUST	MAY
Disconnect	MAY	MUST	MUST	MAY
Put	MAY	MUST	MUST	MAY
Get	MAY	MUST	MUST	MAY
Abort	MAY	MUST	MAY	MAY

3.2.1 Other specifications/erratas affected

Test Conformance documents



4 Diagram clarification

4.1 Problem

The diagram shown in section 4.2 does not show a complete sync, but the text does not explain this fully.

4.2 Solution

Clarify the text with the following replacements for paragraph 2 and 3 in this section:

The following example shows the creation of an OBEX connection, the mapping of PUT and GET requests to the SyncML message transfers, and the OBEX disconnection.

This example is not intended to show a complete a SyncML Session but merely illustrates the use of PUT and GET within a SyncML OBEX binding implementation.

4.2.1 Other specifications/erratas affected

N/A

5 Mime type Corrections

5.1 Problem

The mime type declaration in section 4.2.2 are incorrect

5.2 Solution

The section should read as below :

Client implementations conforming to this specification **MUST** support the header with either the "application/vnd.syncml+xml" or "application/vnd.syncml+wbxml" media type values. Server implementations conforming to this specification **MUST** support both "application/vnd.syncml+xml" and "application/vnd.syncml+wbxml" media type values, as requested by the SyncML Client

5.2.1 Other specifications/erratas affected

N/A

6 References

[[RFC 2119](#)] Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels, [IETF](#).