

# Immutable ArrayBuffers for stage 2

Mark S. Miller  Agoric

Peter Hoddie  moddable

Richard Gibson  Agoric

Jack-Works

105th Plenary  
December 2024

TC  
39

# Recap: Proposed ArrayBuffer API

---

```
transfer(len?: number) :ArrayBuffer
transferToFixedLength(len?: number) :ArrayBuffer
resize(len: number) :void
slice(start?: number, end?: number) :ArrayBuffer
transferToImmutable() :ArrayBuffer
get immutable: boolean
get detached: boolean
get resizable: boolean
get byteLength: number
get maxByteLength: number
```

# Recap: Immutable ArrayBuffer Flavor

---

~~transfer(len?: number) :ArrayBuffer~~

~~transferToFixedLength(len?: number) :ArrayBuffer~~

~~resize(len: number) :void~~

slice(start?: number, end?: number) :ArrayBuffer

~~transferToImmutable() :ArrayBuffer~~

**get immutable: true**

get detached: false

get resizable: false

get byteLength: number

get maxByteLength: same number

# Status Update

---

- Many private positive comments
- No negative comments or objections
- Stage 1 spec text already stage 2 quality
- Moddable XS implementation!!!
- Progress on open questions...

# Open#15: An optional length parameter?

---

Given

```
transfer(len?: number) :ArrayBuffer
```

```
transferToFixedLength(len?: number) :ArrayBuffer
```

do we want

```
transferToImmutable() :ArrayBuffer
```

or

```
transferToImmutable(len?: number) :ArrayBuffer
```

?

The second minimizes damage from surprise.

# Open#9: zero-copy slice?

---

Given

```
slice(start?: number, end?: number) :ArrayBuffer
```

and

```
transferToImmutable() :ArrayBuffer
```

should we add

```
sliceToImmutable(start?: number, end?: number) :ArrayBuffer
```

?

Yes. Too hard to make this zero-copy

```
immuBuf.slice(s,e).transferToImmutable()
```

# Open#10: immutable or mutable ?

---

Should the accessor property be

`immutable` - booleans default to false

or

`mutable` - pos names avoid double negatives

?

favor `immutable`

`if (buf.immutable) ...`

# Open#16: throw, or silently do nothing?

---

Should trying to write data in an immutable ArrayBuffer via a TypedArray element set throw, even though trying to write out-of-bounds or to a detached ArrayBuffer does not?

Should TypedArray write methods (copyWithin, fill, reverse, set, etc.) throw when their backing ArrayBuffer is immutable but the targeted range is zero-length? If so, how early or late in the algorithm? The methods currently inspect arguments after `ValidateTypedArray`.

How early or late in `SetViewValue` against an immutable ArrayBuffer should an exception be thrown? It currently inspects arguments before `IsViewOutOfBounds`.

Likewise for abstract operations such as `ArrayBufferCopyAndDetach` (which currently checks `IsSharedArrayBuffer`, then `newLength`, then `IsDetachedBuffer`).

And also for `Atomics` functions.

Driven by implementor feedback.

But when in doubt, throw.

Moddable XS implementation throws.



# Questions?

---

- Many private positive comments
- No negative comments or objections
- Stage 1 spec text already stage 2 quality
- Moddable XS implementation!!!
- Progress on open questions...

# Stage 2?

---

## Stage 2

---

- ☐ committee approval
- ☐ spec reviewers selected
- ☒ spec text written

## Stage 1

---

- ☒ committee approval