

## **IETF Meeting Assignment**

**Ayça Elif Aktaş**

**27802**

### **1. Title of the session – Speaker(s) Name(s)**

The session is titled " HTTP Working Group Agenda - IETF 119 (HTTP)". The speakers were Steven Bingler, David Schinazi and Marius Kleidl.

### **2. What was the session about?**

The session focused on updates and discussions related to HTTP, specifically updates on the working group drafts about cookies, unprompted authenticate, the query method, and resumable uploads. The session aimed at discussing recent developments, addressing issues, and planning future steps at the working group drafts regarding the topics cookies, unprompted authenticate, the query method, and resumable uploads.

### **3. What do the meeting materials cover? What did the group discuss in previous meetings?**

The meeting materials covered the agenda, the slides used in the discussions, the notes and updates on the HTTP protocols and standards discussed in this meeting and working group drafts about the discussed topics in the meeting. The materials also covered the notes and agenda about the next meeting they did several days later. The group did not have a previous meeting before this one but I think this working group had one more meeting few days later.

### **4. What did the engineers of this session discuss about?**

*Cookies Draft:* Discussion were on resolving the same site redirect chain issue by reverting language and planning to reintegrate it in future RFC 6265 bis specifics. And also there were some discussions about the future steps regarding the topic of relaying the cookie spec.

*Unprompted Authenticate (HTTP Signature Authentication Scheme):* They discussed updates on the implementations, interoperability testing of the new implementations, and considerations for future work, including discussions on how to handle intermediaries.

*Query Method:* Even though the topic was in agenda there were only brief mentions, more detailed discussions about this topic likely will be taking place in future sessions.

*Resumable Uploads:* During the Resumable Uploads section, the engineers covered various major features and issues associated with enhancing and standardizing the process of resuming interrupted file uploads over HTTP. They gave an outline of the purpose of Resumable Upload, which is to allow clients to resume uploads after interruptions without having to retransmit all previous data. They discussed existing server and client implementations, as well as tools for load testing and upload performance. They did, however, point out that not all tools and implementations have been completely published. The engineers discussed updates that has been made to the draft, such as progress messages

for clients on the amount of data saved, explanations for using empty requests, status code modifications for offset retrieval, and enhanced security considerations for the process. They also discussed some topics that are still unclear. Such as upload limits. The discussion was on how to standardize the communication of upload limits from servers to clients, the engineer stated that they were debating between multiple specific header fields or a single header with a dictionary-style approach to inform clients of various limits like total upload size, expiration, and individual request size limits.

## 5. What did you learn in the context of Computer Networks? How did the discussions run (e.g. presentation, discussion, etc.)?

In the context of computer networks, the workshop provided insight on how protocols and standards such as HTTP are constantly updated and refined to solve security concerns, increase functionality, and assure compatibility. Discussions were a combination of presentations on several topics, the presentations included several points such as introduction to the topic, updates from the engineer that has been made to their draft. Also presentations included open issues for discussion regarding the topic, which also included answers from participants on the issues. After the presentations the speaker answered questions from the participants, considered feedback from the participants, and lastly discussed the next steps planned. For me the workshop highlighted the collaborative effort needed in designing network protocols and the importance of tackling both technical and policy-related concerns together.

## 6. Screenshot for evidence of attendance

The screenshot displays the IETF119 HTTPBIS meeting interface. The main slide, titled "IETF119 HTTPBIS", discusses "Upload limits (#2741, #2747)". It lists two options: "Option 1: Separate header fields" and "Option 2: One header fields with dictionary". The slide also includes a "Speaking: []" section. To the right of the slide is a video feed showing three participants: Benjamin Schwartz, Jonathan Hoyland, and Tommy Jensen. Below the video feed is a chat window with messages from Benjamin Schwartz, Jonathan Hoyland, and Tommy Jensen. The chat messages are as follows:

- Benjamin Schwartz (00:42:47): think we don't actually want to key on the channel binding.
- Jonathan Hoyland (00:43:07): I think our initial pass was using Frames and thus this was connection level, which made stuff more obvious
- Tommy Jensen (00:43:19): What if we focus on the fact that the client is acting first... like, ProactiveAuth, or VolunteeredAuth?

The interface also includes a "Transcript" section at the bottom left, a "Datatracker" section at the bottom center, and a "Show Of Hands" section at the bottom right. The transcript shows a message from Neil: "Neil? Awesome. Thank you. The link is in the agenda. For the notes thing, both our agenda and the IETF. And and again, just the high points and especially the the decisions made would be very helpful. Or discussion. I can see