



Change Document for SyncML HTTP Binding

Specification version: 1.0.1

Specification date: 2000-06-15



SyncML Initiative

The following companies are Sponsors of the SyncML Initiative:

Ericsson
IBM
Lotus
Matsushita Communications Industrial Co., Ltd.
Motorola
Nokia
Openwave
Starfish Software
Symbian



Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) Ericsson, IBM, Lotus, Matsushita Communication Industrial Co., Ltd., Motorola, Nokia, Openwave, Palm, Psion, Starfish Software, Symbian, and others (2000-2002). 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, OPENWAVE, PALM, PSION, STARFISH SOFTWARE, SYMBIAN 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, OPENWAVE, PALM, PSION, STARFISH SOFTWARE, SYMBIAN 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.

Attention is called to the possibility that implementation of this specification may require use of subject matter covered by patent rights. By publication of this specification, no position is taken with respect to the existence or validity of any patent rights in connection therewith. The SyncML Initiative is not responsible for identifying patents having necessary claims for which a license may be required by a SyncML Initiative specification or for conducting inquiries into the legal validity or scope of those patents that are brought to its attention.

A patent/application owner has filed a statement of assurance that it will grant licenses under these rights without compensation or under reasonable rates and nondiscriminatory, reasonable terms and conditions to all applicants desiring to obtain such licenses. The SyncML Initiative makes no representation as to the reasonableness of rates and/or terms and conditions of the license agreements offered by patent/application owners. Further information may be obtained from the SyncML Initiative Executive Director.



- 1 Formatting Conventions 5**
 - 1.1 Errata Type Classifications 5
- 2 Errata 6**
 - 2.1 HTTP Content Type 6
 - 2.1.1 Problem 6
 - 2.1.2 Solution..... 6
 - 2.1.3 Other specifications/erratas affected..... 6
 - 2.2 UTF-8 in HTTP 6
 - 2.2.1 Problem 6
 - 2.2.2 Solution..... 6
 - 2.2.3 Other specifications/erratas affected..... 7
 - 2.3 HTTP Authentication 7
 - 2.3.1 Problem 7
 - 2.3.2 Solution..... 7
 - 2.3.3 Other specifications/erratas affected..... 8
 - 2.4 RFC 2119..... 8
 - 2.4.1 Problem 8
 - 2.4.2 Solution..... 8
 - 2.4.3 Other specifications/erratas affected..... 8
- 3 Enhancements 9**
 - 3.1 MIME Types..... 9
 - 3.1.1 Problem 9
 - 3.1.2 Solution..... 9
 - 3.1.3 Other specifications/erratas affected..... 9
- 4 References 9**



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 Errata

2.1 HTTP Content Type

2.1.1 Problem

In several examples the content type is misspelled as 'application/vnd.syncml+xml' instead of 'application/vnd.syncml-wbxml' and 'application/vnd.syncml-wbxml'.

2.1.2 Solution

Correct the typos on pages 10 (3 typos), 16 (2 typos) and 17 (1 typo) to reflect the correct content type as defined in the SyncML representation protocol V 1.0.1.

2.1.3 Other specifications/erratas affected

None.

2.2 UTF-8 in HTTP

2.2.1 Problem

Requiring UTF-8 support imposes a large implementation cost on clients in areas of the world where UTF-8 is not commonly used. Relaxing the client requirements can cause interoperability problems, but will also make for faster insertion into the Japanese and Korean markets.

2.2.2 Solution

In section 5.3.3, Request Headers, change the paragraph that talks about the Accept Charset request header. The current paragraph reads:

"The Accept-Charset request header is used to specify which character sets are acceptable in the response. Implementations conforming to this specification **MUST** support this header with the "UTF-8" character set value. Implementations **MAY** support additional, IANA registered character set values. The following is an example of how this header is specified to indicate that the client expects responses formatted into the UTF-8 character set:

Accept-Charset: UTF-8"

The new version of that paragraph will read:

"The Accept-Charset request header is used to specify which character sets are acceptable in the response. Server implementations conforming to this specification **MUST** support this header with the "UTF-8" character set value. Client implementations **SHOULD** support the "UTF-8" character set. Implementations **MAY** support additional, IANA registered character set values. Client implementations not supporting UTF-8 **SHOULD** take careful consideration of the potential impact of lack of UTF-8 support on interoperability of the device. If a recipient is unable to provide support for the character set encoding specified in the Accept-Charset request headers sent by the originator, the recipient **MUST** send to the



originator a HTTP status 406, "Not acceptable". This is in keeping with [RFC2616]. Note that there will be no SyncML message sent with this response. The following is an example of how this header is specified to indicate that the client expects responses formatted into the UTF-8 character set:

Accept-Charset: UTF-8"

In section 7, References, add a reference to IANA, specifically the registered character set:

<http://www.iana.org/assignments/character-sets>.

2.2.3 Other specifications/erratas affected

None.

2.3 HTTP Authentication

2.3.1 Problem

At the moment a HTTP client must support authentication on SyncML level and may support authentication on HTTP level but the server must support authentication on both levels. The WSP protocol does not have an equivalent method for authentication with MD5 (Digest) so the WSP client can not support this authentication method.

Problem occurs in the server when a server supports both HTTP and WSP (though a WAP Gateway) clients.

2.3.2 Solution

Change the MUST to MAY so the server can handle HTTP clients and WSP client (though a WAP Gateway) in the same way.

Change from:

5.3.3 Request Header

Authorization	MUST	MUST
Proxy-Authorization	MUST	MUST

5.3.4 Response Header

Authentication-Info	MUST	MUST
Proxy-Authenticate	MUST	MUST
WWW-Authenticate	MUST	MUST

Change to:

5.3.3 Request Header

Authorization	MAY	MAY
Proxy-Authorization	MAY	MAY

5.3.4 Response Header



Authentication-Info	MAY	MAY
Proxy-Authenticate	MAY	MAY
WWW-Authenticate	MAY	MAY

The description must also be changed from MUST to MAY.

2.3.3 Other specifications/erratas affected

None.

2.4 RFC 2119

2.4.1 Problem

The current definition is unclear about how to interpret a receiving element when the "Static Conformance Requirements" column defines an element as MAY.

In almost every document we have a reference to www.ietf.org and in chapter "Static Conformance Requirements" we have:

"In these tables, optional features are specified by a "MAY", mandatory features are specified by a "MUST" and recommended features are specified by a "SHOULD"."

2.4.2 Solution

Change the reference to RFC2119 and include the MAY definition from the RFC under the chapter "Static Conformance Requirements":

"An implementation which does not include a particular option MUST be prepared to interoperate with another implementation which does include the option, though perhaps with reduced functionality."

2.4.3 Other specifications/erratas affected

None.



3 Enhancements

3.1 MIME Types

3.1.1 Problem

SyncML Binding documents do not include SyncML Device Management MIME types.

3.1.2 Solution

Change the text as described below.

Data synchronization client implementations conforming to this specification **MUST** support this header with either the "application/vnd.syncml+xml" or "application/vnd.syncml+wbxml" media type values. Data synchronization 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 data synchronization client.

Device Management client implementations conforming to this specification **MUST** support this header with either the "application/vnd.syncml.dm+xml" or "application/vnd.syncml.dm+wbxml" media type values. Device management server implementations conforming to this specification **MUST** support both "application/vnd.syncml.dm+xml" and "application/vnd.syncml.dm+wbxml" media type values, as requested by the SyncML device management client.

The following is an example of how this header is specified to indicate that the client expects responses formatted according to the clear-text, XML [5] representation of SyncML data synchronization:

```
Accept: application/vnd.syncml+xml
```

The following is an example of how this header is specified to indicate that the client expects responses formatted according to the binary, WBXML [4] representation of SyncML device management

```
Accept: application/vnd.syncml.dm+wbxml
```

3.1.3 Other specifications/erratas affected

None.

4 References

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