



Errata to SyncML WSP 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



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 WAP version clarification..... 6**
 - 2.1 Problem..... 6
 - 2.2 Solution..... 6
 - 2.2.1 Other specifications/erratas affected..... 6
- 3 Removal of confusing information..... 6**
 - 3.1 Problem..... 6
 - 3.2 Solution..... 6
 - 3.2.1 Other specifications/erratas affected..... 6
- 4 Wrong SyncML MIME type 6**
 - 4.1 Problem..... 6
 - 4.2 Solution..... 6
 - 4.2.1 Other specifications/erratas affected..... 6
- 5 Removal of confusing information..... 7**
 - 5.1 Problem..... 7
 - 5.2 Solution..... 7
 - 5.2.1 Other specifications/erratas affected..... 7
- 6 Better explanation regarding the usage of PUSH 7**
 - 6.1 Problem..... 7
 - 6.2 Solution..... 7
 - 6.2.1 Other specifications/erratas affected..... 7
- 7 Update reference section 8**
 - 7.1 Problem..... 8
 - 7.2 Solution..... 8
 - 7.2.1 Other specifications/erratas affected..... 8
- 8 Add SCR chapter 8**
 - 8.1 Problem..... 8
 - 8.2 Solution..... 8
 - 8.2.1 Other specifications affected..... 8
- 9 References 8**



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 interoperated 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 behaviour.

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 WAP version clarification

2.1 Problem

In the document it's referred to WAP version 1.2. This should be June Release 2000, which is not the same (they were released really close to each other though).

2.2 Solution

Change from WAP version 1.2 to WAP Release 2000 on page 1, 5 and 9.

2.2.1 Other specifications/erratas affected

N/A

3 Removal of confusing information

3.1 Problem

The last sentence in chapter 5.1 does not clarify anything, instead it's only confusing.

3.2 Solution

Remove the sentence ' This version of the specification does NOT support transferring SyncML messages across WSP using a "multipart" MIME media type.' from chapter 5.1.

3.2.1 Other specifications/erratas affected

N/A

4 Wrong SyncML MIME type

4.1 Problem

The MIME types mentioned in chapter 5.2 are wrong.

4.2 Solution

Change the '-' in the MIME types in chapter 5.2 to a '+'.

4.2.1 Other specifications/erratas affected

N/A



5 Removal of confusing information

5.1 Problem

The fifth row in chapter 5.3.2.2 goes 'The implementations complying with this specification MUST support the POST method.' Actually a WAP device MUST support both the GET and the POST method and that makes this sentence a bit confusing.

5.2 Solution

Change the sentence to 'Of all the HTTP methods supported by WSP, the SyncML functionality only requires the POST method'.

5.2.1 Other specifications/erratas affected

N/A

6 Better explanation regarding the usage of PUSH

6.1 Problem

Chapter 5.5 that explains the usage of PUSH needs to be clarified regarding PUSH identifier and content type usage.

6.2 Solution

Add the following sentence to the chapter:

'When pushing SyncML data from the server to the client, the PUSH id 0x05 MUST be used and the either of the content types defined in chapter 5.2 MUST be used.'

6.2.1 Other specifications/erratas affected

N/A



7 Update reference section

7.1 Problem

The reference section is referring to old specifications and also lacks proper PUSH specification references. This has also been pointed out in a LS from the WAP WAG data synchronisation group within the WAP forum.

7.2 Solution

Update the current references to the proper ones (June Release 2000) and add the PUSH OTA and the PUSH Message specifications as references

7.2.1 Other specifications/erratas affected

N/A

8 Add SCR chapter

8.1 Problem

The WSP binding spec does today not contain a proper SRC table.

8.2 Solution

Add a table stating that the POST method is mandatory for both server and client and that the PUSH functionality is optional for both server and client.

8.2.1 Other specifications affected

N/A

9 References

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