

CoRE  
Internet-Draft  
Intended status: Standards Track  
Expires: September 9, 2019

T. Fossati  
ARM  
K. Hartke  
Ericsson  
C. Bormann  
Universitaet Bremen TZI  
March 08, 2019

**Multipart Content-Format for CoAP**  
**draft-ietf-core-multipart-ct-03**

Abstract

This memo defines application/multipart-core, an application-independent media-type that can be used to combine representations of zero or more different media types into a single message, such as a CoAP request or response body, with minimal framing overhead, each along with a CoAP Content-Format identifier.

Status of This Memo

This Internet-Draft is submitted in full conformance with the provisions of [BCP 78](#) and [BCP 79](#).

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts. The list of current Internet-Drafts is at <https://datatracker.ietf.org/drafts/current/>.

Internet-Drafts are draft documents valid for a maximum of six months and may be updated, replaced, or obsoleted by other documents at any time. It is inappropriate to use Internet-Drafts as reference material or to cite them other than as "work in progress."

This Internet-Draft will expire on September 9, 2019.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2019 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

This document is subject to [BCP 78](#) and the IETF Trust's Legal Provisions Relating to IETF Documents (<https://trustee.ietf.org/license-info>) in effect on the date of publication of this document. Please review these documents carefully, as they describe your rights and restrictions with respect to this document. Code Components extracted from this document must

include Simplified BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the Trust Legal Provisions and are provided without warranty as described in the Simplified BSD License.

## Table of Contents

<a href="#">1.</a>	Introduction . . . . .	<a href="#">2</a>
<a href="#">1.1.</a>	Requirements Language . . . . .	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">2.</a>	Multipart Content-Format Encoding . . . . .	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">3.</a>	Usage Examples . . . . .	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">3.1.</a>	Observing Resources . . . . .	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">4.</a>	Implementation hints . . . . .	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">5.</a>	IANA Considerations . . . . .	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">5.1.</a>	Registration of media type application/multipart-core . .	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">5.2.</a>	Registration of a Content-Format identifier for application/multipart-core . . . . .	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">6.</a>	Security Considerations . . . . .	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">7.</a>	References . . . . .	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">7.1.</a>	Normative References . . . . .	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">7.2.</a>	Informative References . . . . .	<a href="#">7</a>
	Acknowledgements . . . . .	<a href="#">8</a>
	Authors' Addresses . . . . .	<a href="#">8</a>

## [1.](#) Introduction

This memo defines application/multipart-core, an application-independent media-type that can be used to combine representations of zero or more different media types into a single message, such as a CoAP [[RFC7252](#)] request or response body, with minimal framing overhead, each along with a CoAP Content-Format identifier.

This simple and efficient binary framing mechanism can be employed to create application specific request and response bodies which build on multiple already existing media types.

The individual representations in an application/multipart-core body occur in a sequence, which may be employed by an application where such a sequence is natural, e.g. for a number of audio snippets in different formats to be played out in that sequence.

In other cases, an application may be more interested in a bag of representations, which are distinguished by their Content-Format identifier, such as an audio snippet and a text representation accompanying it. In such a case, the sequence in which these occur may not be relevant to the application. This specification allows to indicate that an optional part is not present by substituting a null value for the representation of the part.



A third situation that is common only ever has a single representation in the sequence, which is one of a set of formats possible. This kind of union of formats may also make the presence of the actual representation optional, the omission of which leads to a zero-length array.

Where these rules are not sufficient for an application, it might still use the general format defined here, but register a new media type and an associated Content-Format identifier to associate the representation with these more specific semantics instead of using application/multipart-core.

### **1.1. Requirements Language**

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 [BCP 14](#) [[RFC2119](#)] [[RFC8174](#)] when, and only when, they appear in all capitals, as shown here.

## **2. Multipart Content-Format Encoding**

A representation of media-type application/multipart-core contains a collection of zero or more representations, each along with their respective content format.

The collection is encoded as a CBOR [[RFC7049](#)] array with an even number of elements. The second, fourth, sixth, etc. element is a byte string containing a representation, or the value "null" if an optional part is indicated as not given. The first, third, fifth, etc. element is an unsigned integer specifying the content format ID of the representation following it.

For example, a collection containing two representations, one with content format ID 42 and one with content format ID 0, looks like this in CBOR diagnostic notation:

```
[42, h'0123456789abcdef', 0, h'3031323334']
```

For illustration, the structure of an application/multipart-core representation can be described by the CDDL [[I-D.ietf-cbor-cddl](#)] specification in Figure 1:

```
multipart-core = [* multipart-part]
multipart-part = (type: uint .size 2, part: bytes / null)
```

Figure 1: CDDL for application/multipart-core



This format is intended as a strict specification: An implementation **MUST** stop processing the representation if there is a CBOR well-formedness error, a deviation from the structure defined above, or any residual data left after processing the CBOR data item. (This generally means the representation is not processed at all except if some streaming processing has already happened.)

### 3. Usage Examples

#### 3.1. Observing Resources

When a client registers to observe a resource [[RFC7641](#)] for which no representation is available yet, the server may send one or more 2.05 (Content) notifications before sending the first actual 2.05 (Content) or 2.03 (Valid) notification. The possible resulting sequence of notifications is shown in Figure 1.




Figure 2: Sequence of Notifications:

The specification of the Observe option requires that all notifications carry the same Content-Format. The application/multipart-core media type can be used to provide that Content-Format: e.g., carrying an empty list of representations in the case marked as "Pending" in Figure 2, and carrying a single representation specified as the target content-format in the case in the middle of the figure.

### 4. Implementation hints

This section describes the serialization for readers that may be new to CBOR. It does not contain any new information.

An application/multipart-core representation carrying no representations is represented by an empty CBOR array, which is serialized as a single byte with the value 0x80.

An application/multipart-core representation carrying a single representation is represented by a two-element CBOR array, which is serialized as 0x82 followed by the two elements. The first element is an unsigned integer for the Content-Format value, which is



represented as described in Table 1. The second element is the object as a byte string, which is represented as a length as described in Table 2 followed by the bytes of the object.

Serialization	Value
0x00..0x17	0..23
0x18 0xnn	24..255
0x19 0xnn 0xnn	256..65535

Table 1: Serialization of content-format

Serialization	Length
0x40..0x57	0..23
0x58 0xnn	24..255
0x59 0xnn 0xnn	256..65535
0x5a 0xnn 0xnn 0xnn 0xnn	65536..4294967295
0x5b 0xnn .. 0xnn (8 bytes)	4294967296..

Table 2: Serialization of object length

For example, a single text/plain object (content-format 0) of value "Hello World" (11 characters) would be serialized as

```
0x82 0x00 0x4b H e l l o 0x20 w o r l d
```

In effect, the serialization for a single object is done by prefixing the object with information that there is one object (here: 0x82), about its content-format (here: 0x00) and its length (here: 0x4b).

For more than one representation included in an application/multipart-core representation, the head of the CBOR array is adjusted (0x84 for two representations, 0x86 for three, ...) and the sequences of content-format and embedded representations follow.

## 5. IANA Considerations

### 5.1. Registration of media type application/multipart-core

IANA is requested to register the following media type [[RFC6838](#)]:

Type name: application





Subtype name: multipart-core

Required parameters: N/A

Optional parameters: N/A

Encoding considerations: binary

Security considerations: See the Security Considerations Section of RFCthis

Interoperability considerations: N/A

Published specification: RFCthis

Applications that use this media type: Applications that need to combine representations of zero or more different media types into one, e.g., EST-CoAP [[I-D.ietf-ace-coap-est](#)]

Fragment identifier considerations: The syntax and semantics of fragment identifiers specified for "application/multipart-core" is as specified for "application/cbor". (At publication of this document, there is no fragment identification syntax defined for "application/cbor".)

Additional information:

Deprecated alias names for this type: N/A

Magic number(s): N/A

File extension(s): N/A

Macintosh file type code(s): N/A

Person & email address to contact for further information:  
iesg@ietf.org

Intended usage: COMMON

Restrictions on usage: N/A

Author: CoRE WG

Change controller: IESG

Provisional registration? (standards tree only): no



## 5.2. Registration of a Content-Format identifier for application/multipart-core

IANA is requested to register the following Content-Format to the "CoAP Content-Formats" subregistry, within the "Constrained RESTful Environments (CoRE) Parameters" registry, from the Expert Review space (0..255):

Media Type	Encoding	ID	Reference
application/multipart-core	--	TBD1	RFCthis

## 6. Security Considerations

The security considerations of [RFC7049] apply. In particular, resource exhaustion attacks may employ large values for the byte string size fields, or deeply nested structures of recursively embedded application/multipart-core representations.

## 7. References

### 7.1. Normative References

- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 2119](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC2119, March 1997, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2119>>.
- [RFC7049] Bormann, C. and P. Hoffman, "Concise Binary Object Representation (CBOR)", [RFC 7049](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC7049, October 2013, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7049>>.
- [RFC7252] Shelby, Z., Hartke, K., and C. Bormann, "The Constrained Application Protocol (CoAP)", [RFC 7252](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC7252, June 2014, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7252>>.
- [RFC8174] Leiba, B., "Ambiguity of Uppercase vs Lowercase in [RFC 2119](#) Key Words", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 8174](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8174, May 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8174>>.

### 7.2. Informative References



[I-D.ietf-ace-coap-est]

Stok, P., Kampanakis, P., Richardson, M., and S. Raza,  
"EST over secure CoAP (EST-coaps)", [draft-ietf-ace-coap-est-10](#) (work in progress), March 2019.

[I-D.ietf-cbor-cddl]

Birkholz, H., Vigano, C., and C. Bormann, "Concise data  
definition language (CDDL): a notational convention to  
express CBOR and JSON data structures", [draft-ietf-cbor-cddl-07](#) (work in progress), February 2019.

[RFC6838] Freed, N., Klensin, J., and T. Hansen, "Media Type  
Specifications and Registration Procedures", [BCP 13](#),  
[RFC 6838](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC6838, January 2013,  
<<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6838>>.

[RFC7641] Hartke, K., "Observing Resources in the Constrained  
Application Protocol (CoAP)", [RFC 7641](#),  
DOI 10.17487/RFC7641, September 2015,  
<<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7641>>.

## Acknowledgements

Most of the text in this draft is from earlier contributions by two  
of the authors, Thomas Fossati and Klaus Hartke. The re-mix in this  
document is based on the requirements in [\[I-D.ietf-ace-coap-est\]](#),  
based on discussions with Michael Richardson, Panos Kampanis and  
Peter van der Stok.

## Authors' Addresses

Thomas Fossati  
ARM

Email: [thomas.fossati@arm.com](mailto:thomas.fossati@arm.com)

Klaus Hartke  
Ericsson  
Torshamnsgatan 23  
Stockholm SE-16483  
Sweden

Email: [klaus.hartke@ericsson.com](mailto:klaus.hartke@ericsson.com)



Carsten Bormann  
Universitaet Bremen TZI  
Postfach 330440  
Bremen D-28359  
Germany

Phone: +49-421-218-63921

Email: [cabo@tzi.org](mailto:cabo@tzi.org)