



IETF 96 - 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).
- 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 headed formats in future versions of HTTP?

Links

- Spec: [draft-ietf-httpbis-jfv-00](#)
- Issues: [Github](#)