
MIMI Interim

Transport vs delivery service

May 3, 2023

Raphael Robert & Konrad Kohbrok

Status quo

3 proposals for delivery service/transport:


- draft-ralston-mimi-linearized-matrix-00
- draft-rosenberg-mimi-protocol-00
- draft-robert-mimi-delivery-service-00

Consensus

Rough consensus on architecture questions:

- Groups/conversations/rooms are “owned” by one provider
- Other providers are “guests/participants”
- RESTful API (except long polling)

Architecture



Disensus

Where we don't agree yet:

- Client-to-server vs. server-to-server protocol
- Scope of the protocol
- Fanout mechanism (pull vs push)
- Consumer vs enterprise (metadata question)

draft-ralston-mimi-linearized-matrix-00

Informed by how Matrix works

- Departs from P2P Matrix philosophy
- Aligns with the rough architecture consensus
- Has a lot of dependencies from the rest of the Matrix universe
- Potentially undesirable side-effects (history on the server, metadata)

draft-rosenberg-mimi-protocol-00

Informed by how large enterprise providers work

- Comprehensive, batteries included approach
- Vast scope, beyond MLS delivery service & transport
- Blurs abstraction layers in the stack
- Uses long poll during fanout, how does that scale in open federation?


draft-robert-mimi-delivery-service-00

Informed by how MLS works

- Not a transport protocol, only specifies messages between client and owning provider
- Is agnostic of a specific transport protocol (HTTPS/Matrix/XMPP)
- Is agnostic of the client-to-server vs. server-to-server question
- Can cover both consumer & enterprise messaging
- Scope is as narrow as possible and modelled on MLS operations


Delivery Service

Delivery Service



Server-to-server transport

Server-to-server transport



Fanout

Fanout

