Adopting the Bundle Format

Jeffrey Yasskin WPACK — IETF 110 2021-03-12 <u>draft-yasskin-wpack-bundled-exchanges-04</u>

Goal

Agree to adopt draft-yasskin-wpack-bundled-exchanges as a starting point for further design.

Structure of draft-yasskin-wpack-bundled-exchanges

- Semantics
- Performance expectations
- Format w/o algorithms
 - Invariant bit + Sections + trailing length
 - Core section definitions
- Security considerations

Semantics

"A bundle is logically a set of HTTP representations, themselves represented by HTTP response messages."

Representations are named by their URLs + content negotiation information (but see a later slide).

Performance

Random Access

• O(index size) before starting to return resource bytes

Streaming

- Sender needs all resource sizes before starting.
- Receiver returns a resource O(1) bytes behind what it has received.

Overall format

CBOR

- 1. Magic number
- 2. Version number
- 3. Primary/fallback URL (but see a later slide)
- 4. Section index
- 5. Sections
- 6. Total size

Core Sections

- Index: Response name -> byte range in Responses
- Manifest: App manifest, EPUB Package Document, etc. (but see a later slide)
- Critical: "Reject the bundle if you don't support these extension sections"
- Responses

There's an IANA registry for extension sections.

A few open PRs

Hum to accept or reject them for now?

We can change our minds later.

Motivation for these changes

Focus the initially-adopted I-D on what's needed for **all** use cases.

Plan to adopt more-focused extension I-Ds to support particular use cases.

The subresource loading use case seems to need the fewest features, so it drives these proposals.

Move the primary/fallback URL to a section (#617)

- Designed to allow a client to drop compatibility with old versions.
- Not all use cases have a primary URL
 - Representing a whole web page or iframe does.
 - Representing a group of subresources doesn't.
- If the bundle version isn't supported, much more efficient for the server to avoid sending a bundle in the first place.

Remove content negotiation (#618)

- Online
 - Online use cases will probably content-negotiate for the bundle as a whole.
 - Including multiple representations for 1 resource would waste space.
- Offline
 - Offline use cases might use this to support multiple languages.
 - Format negotiation would probably use a least-common-denominator format instead.
- CDNs and caches might like content negotiation info.

Move the manifest section out of the core $(\frac{\#619}{})$

- Top-level document refers to its manifest.
- Manifest refers to the top-level document.
- Naming both at the top level saves parsing one in cases the client needs the other.
- Maybe doesn't pay for the complexity.

Remove the critical section $(\frac{\#619}{})$

- Better to negotiate for a bundle the client understands than reject it after the fact.
- Hard to add this later.