



IETF 97 - JSON Field Values

[Julian Reschke](#), greenbytes

History

- Started as a thought experiment in July 2014 (draft-reschke-http-jfv)
- Adopted as WG document in June 2016 (draft-ietf-httpbis-jfv)
- Motivation is captured in IETF 95 slides: [ietf-95-httpbis-header-field-parsing](#)

Discussion

Current document driven by the goal to make it easier to define new header fields, to be used in both HTTP/1.1 and HTTP/2 -- avoiding predictable problems such as I18N or list syntax.

- Proposed format can be chatty. Several proposals for minimization.
- Embrace list format (repeating header fields), as currently proposed, or try to get rid of it?
- Opt-in per header field definition (current proposal), or applicable more widely? (header field naming convention?)
- Is JSON the right format anyway? Concerns about data model (number formats) and potential interop issues (non-unique member names). Some of these concerns might be addressed by leveraging I-JSON (RFC 7493) and ECMA-262, see [Section 9](#) of draft-ietf-httpbis-jfv-02.
- Is this just a step forwards to a common format that can be used in HTTP/1.1 and HTTP/2, or should we also start to discuss header formats in future versions of HTTP?

Timing

Specs in W3C have started using the syntax:

- <https://www.w3.org/TR/2016/WD-reporting-1-20160407/#header>
- <https://www.w3.org/TR/clear-site-data/#header>
- <https://wicg.github.io/feature-policy/#feature-policy-http-header-field>

What should we tell the authors?

Links

- Spec: [draft-ietf-httpbis-jfv-02](#)
- Issues: [Github](#)