[MS-XOPP]:

XML-binary Optimized Packaging (XOP) Profile

Intellectual Property Rights Notice for Open Specifications Documentation

- Technical Documentation. Microsoft publishes Open Specifications documentation for protocols, file formats, languages, standards as well as overviews of the interaction among each of these technologies.
- **Copyrights**. This documentation is covered by Microsoft copyrights. Regardless of any other terms that are contained in the terms of use for the Microsoft website that hosts this documentation, you may make copies of it in order to develop implementations of the technologies described in the Open Specifications and may distribute portions of it in your implementations using these technologies or your documentation as necessary to properly document the implementation. You may also distribute in your implementation, with or without modification, any schema, IDL's, or code samples that are included in the documentation. This permission also applies to any documents that are referenced in the Open Specifications.
- **No Trade Secrets**. Microsoft does not claim any trade secret rights in this documentation.
- Patents. Microsoft has patents that may cover your implementations of the technologies described in the Open Specifications. Neither this notice nor Microsoft's delivery of the documentation grants any licenses under those or any other Microsoft patents. However, a given Open Specification may be covered by Microsoft Open Specification Promise or the Community Promise. If you would prefer a written license, or if the technologies described in the Open Specifications are not covered by the Open Specifications Promise or Community Promise, as applicable, patent licenses are available by contacting ipla@microsoft.com.
- Trademarks. The names of companies and products contained in this documentation may be covered by trademarks or similar intellectual property rights. This notice does not grant any licenses under those rights. For a list of Microsoft trademarks, visit www.microsoft.com/trademarks.
- Fictitious Names. The example companies, organizations, products, domain names, e-mail addresses, logos, people, places, and events depicted in this documentation are fictitious. No association with any real company, organization, product, domain name, email address, logo, person, place, or event is intended or should be inferred.

Reservation of Rights. All other rights are reserved, and this notice does not grant any rights other than specifically described above, whether by implication, estoppel, or otherwise.

Tools. The Open Specifications do not require the use of Microsoft programming tools or programming environments in order for you to develop an implementation. If you have access to Microsoft programming tools and environments you are free to take advantage of them. Certain Open Specifications are intended for use in conjunction with publicly available standard specifications and network programming art, and assumes that the reader either is familiar with the aforementioned material or has immediate access to it.

Revision Summary

Date	Revision History	Revision Class	Comments
12/5/2008	0.1	Major	Initial Availability
1/16/2009	0.1.1	Editorial	Changed language and formatting in the technical content.
2/27/2009	0.1.2	Editorial	Changed language and formatting in the technical content.
4/10/2009	0.1.3	Editorial	Changed language and formatting in the technical content.
5/22/2009	0.1.4	Editorial	Changed language and formatting in the technical content.
7/2/2009	0.1.5	Editorial	Changed language and formatting in the technical content.
8/14/2009	0.1.6	Editorial	Changed language and formatting in the technical content.
9/25/2009	0.2	Minor	Clarified the meaning of the technical content.
11/6/2009	0.2.1	Editorial	Changed language and formatting in the technical content.
12/18/2009	0.2.2	Editorial	Changed language and formatting in the technical content.
1/29/2010	0.2.3	Editorial	Changed language and formatting in the technical content.
3/12/2010	0.2.4	Editorial	Changed language and formatting in the technical content.
4/23/2010	0.2.5	Editorial	Changed language and formatting in the technical content.
6/4/2010	0.2.6	Editorial	Changed language and formatting in the technical content.
7/16/2010	0.2.6	None	No changes to the meaning, language, or formatting of the technical content.
8/27/2010	0.2.6	None	No changes to the meaning, language, or formatting of the technical content.
10/8/2010	0.2.6	None	No changes to the meaning, language, or formatting of the technical content.
11/19/2010	0.2.6	None	No changes to the meaning, language, or formatting of the technical content.
1/7/2011	0.2.6	None	No changes to the meaning, language, or formatting of the technical content.
2/11/2011	0.2.6	None	No changes to the meaning, language, or formatting of the technical content.
3/25/2011	0.2.6	None	No changes to the meaning, language, or formatting of the technical content.
5/6/2011	0.2.6	None	No changes to the meaning, language, or formatting of the technical content.
6/17/2011	0.3	Minor	Clarified the meaning of the technical content.
9/23/2011	0.3	None	No changes to the meaning, language, or formatting of the technical content.
12/16/2011	1.0	Major	Updated and revised the technical content.
3/30/2012	1.0	None	No changes to the meaning, language, or formatting of the

Date	Revision History	Revision Class	Comments
			technical content.
7/12/2012	1.0	None	No changes to the meaning, language, or formatting of the technical content.
10/25/2012	1.0	None	No changes to the meaning, language, or formatting of the technical content.
1/31/2013	1.0	None	No changes to the meaning, language, or formatting of the technical content.
8/8/2013	1.1	Minor	Clarified the meaning of the technical content.
11/14/2013	1.1	None	No changes to the meaning, language, or formatting of the technical content.
2/13/2014	1.1	None	No changes to the meaning, language, or formatting of the technical content.
5/15/2014	1.1	None	No changes to the meaning, language, or formatting of the technical content.
6/30/2015	2.0	Major	Significantly changed the technical content.
10/16/2015	2.0	No Change	No changes to the meaning, language, or formatting of the technical content.

Table of Contents

1	Intro	duction	5
		Glossary	
	1.2	References	5
	1.2.1	Normative References	5
	1.2.2	Informative References	6
	1.3	Overview	
	1.3.1	MIME Parts Ordering in Multipart/Related XOP Package Extension	6
	1.4	Relationship to Other Protocols	6
		Prerequisites/Preconditions	
		Applicability Statement	
		Versioning and Capability Negotiation	
		Vendor-Extensible Fields	
	1.9	Standards Assignments	7
2	Mess	ages	8
_		Transport	
		Message Syntax	
	2.2.1		
3	Proto	ocol Details	9
4	Proto	ocol Examples	10
•		MIME Multipart/Related XOP Package Ordering	
5	Secu	rity	11
_		Security Considerations for Implementers	
		Index of Security Parameters	
		·	
6	Appe	ndix A: Product Behavior	12
7	Chan	ge Tracking	13
8	Inde	x	14

1 Introduction

XML-binary Optimized Packaging (XOP), as specified in [XML-XOP], defines a method for the efficient serialization of **XML Information Sets (XML Infosets)** that have certain types of content. The XML-binary Optimized Packaging (XOP) Profile extends XOP to allow for the creation of more efficient implementations that process XML Infosets. This document, [MS-XOPP], describes the serialization rules for XML Infosets as MIME Multipart/Related **XOP packages** but does not specify how these XML Infosets are transmitted between network nodes.

Sections 1.8, 2, and 3 of this specification are normative and can contain the terms MAY, SHOULD, MUST, MUST NOT, and SHOULD NOT as defined in [RFC2119]. Sections 1.5 and 1.9 are also normative but do not contain those terms. All other sections and examples in this specification are informative.

1.1 Glossary

The following terms are specific to this document:

- **Multipurpose Internet Mail Extensions (MIME)**: A set of extensions that redefines and expands support for various types of content in email messages, as described in [RFC2046], and [RFC2047].
- **SOAP message**: An XML document consisting of a mandatory SOAP envelope, an optional SOAP header, and a mandatory SOAP body. See [SOAP1.2-1/2007] section 5 for more information.
- **streaming**: The act of processing a part of an **XML Infoset** without requiring that the entire **XML Infoset** be available.
- **XML Information Set (Infoset)**: An abstract data set that provides a consistent set of definitions for use in specifications that refer to the information in a well-formed XML document, as described in [XMLINFOSET].
- **XML-binary Optimized Packaging (XOP)**: The packaging convention that efficiently serializes XML Infosets that contain certain types of content, as described in [XML-XOP].
- **XOP Information Set (XOP Infoset)**: An XML Infoset in which optimized content has been removed and replaced by <xop:Include> SOAP element information items, as described in [XML-XOP].
- **XOP package**: A package that offers an alternate serialization of an XML Infoset and that contains the XOP document and any optimized content from the original XML Infoset, as described in [XML-XOP].
- MAY, SHOULD, MUST, SHOULD NOT, MUST NOT: These terms (in all caps) are used as defined in [RFC2119]. All statements of optional behavior use either MAY, SHOULD, or SHOULD NOT.

1.2 References

Links to a document in the Microsoft Open Specifications library point to the correct section in the most recently published version of the referenced document. However, because individual documents in the library are not updated at the same time, the section numbers in the documents may not match. You can confirm the correct section numbering by checking the Errata.

1.2.1 Normative References

We conduct frequent surveys of the normative references to assure their continued availability. If you have any issue with finding a normative reference, please contact dochelp@microsoft.com. We will assist you in finding the relevant information.

[RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", BCP 14, RFC 2119, March 1997, http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc2119.txt

[RFC2387] Levinson, E., "The MIME Multipart/Related Content-type", RFC 2387, August 1998, http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc2387.txt

[XML-XOP] Gudgin, M., Mendelsohn, N., Nottingham, M., and Ruellan, H., "XML-binary Optimized Packaging", January 25, 2005, http://www.w3.org/TR/2005/REC-xop10-20050125

1.2.2 Informative References

[SOAP-MTOM] Gudgin, M., Medelsohn, N., Nottingham, M., and Ruellan, H., "SOAP Message Transmission Optimization Mechanism", W3C Recommendation, 25 January 2005, http://www.w3.org/TR/2005/REC-soap12-mtom-20050125/

1.3 Overview

The XML-binary Optimized Packaging (XOP) Profile provides extensions that enable more efficient implementations of [XML-XOP] to be built by requiring certain ordering of the **Multipurpose Internet Mail Extensions (MIME)** XML Information Set (XML Infoset) parts in the XOP package.

1.3.1 MIME Parts Ordering in Multipart/Related XOP Package Extension

The standard XOP implementation, as specified in [XML-XOP] section 4.1, is not allowed to consider the ordering of MIME parts to be significant to XOP processing or to the construction of the **XOP Infoset** for MIME Multipart/Related packaging. The XML-binary Optimized Packaging (XOP) Profile extends the MIME Multipart/Related packaging mechanism specified in [XML-XOP] to allow for the ordering of the MIME parts, as described in section 2.2.1. These extensions enable the creation of more efficient implementations for processing an XML Infoset packaged in MIME Multipart/Related XOP packages when **streaming**.

1.4 Relationship to Other Protocols

The XML-binary Optimized Packaging (XOP) Profile is an extension of [XML-XOP]. The extensions specified in this document [MS-XOPP] do not introduce any new protocol relationships beyond those specified in [XML-XOP] Appendix A.

1.5 Prerequisites/Preconditions

There are no prerequisites or preconditions beyond those specified in [XML-XOP] Appendix A.

1.6 Applicability Statement

The MIME Parts Ordering in Multipart/Related XOP Package Extension specified in section <u>1.3.1</u> is applicable when an XOP Infoset packaged in a MIME Multipart/Related XOP package is processed in streaming fashion.

These extensions are not applicable to XOP packaging mechanisms other than MIME and those that do not specify their own packaging mechanism.

If broad interoperability with implementations strictly compliant with <a>[XML-XOP] is desired, these extensions may not be a suitable choice.

1.7 Versioning and Capability Negotiation

There is no versioning or capability negotiation beyond that specified in [XML-XOP].

1.8 Vendor-Extensible Fields

There are no vendor-extensible fields beyond those specified in [XML-XOP].

1.9 Standards Assignments

There are no standards assignments beyond those specified in <a>[XML-XOP].

2 Messages

2.1 Transport

This specification defines only serialization rules for XOP packages and does not define how XOP packages are transmitted on the network. As such, it does not have a transport.

2.2 Message Syntax

Except as specified in section 2.2.1, the syntax used for specifying MIME Multipart/Related XOP packaging is as specified in [XML-XOP] section 3, [XML-XOP] section 4.1, and [RFC2387].

2.2.1 Ordering of the MIME Parts in XOP Packages

The extensions provided by the XML-binary Optimized Packaging (XOP) Profile override the following text located in [XML-XOP] section 4.1:

"Except for purposes of determining the root MIME part, as specified by [RFC2387], ordering of MIME parts MUST NOT be considered significant to XOP processing or to the construction of the XOP Infoset."

In streaming mode negotiated through a process that is out of band to this protocol, the root MIME part MUST appear first in a MIME Multipart/Related XOP package, and the subsequent MIME parts MUST appear in the order which they appear in the corresponding XML Infoset. <1>

3 Protocol Details

The XML-binary Optimized Packaging (XOP) Profile does not introduce any new protocol roles or change any existing protocol roles that are defined in [XML-XOP].

4 Protocol Examples

4.1 MIME Multipart/Related XOP Package Ordering

The XML-binary Optimized Packaging (XOP) Profile does not introduce any new protocol roles or change any existing protocol roles that are defined in [XML-XOP]. Examples of how MIME Multipart/Related XOP packages are ordered are provided in [XML-XOP] section 1.2.

5 Security

5.1 Security Considerations for Implementers

Security considerations are the same as those specified in $\underline{\hbox{[XML-XOP]}}$ section 6.

5.2 Index of Security Parameters

None.

6 Appendix A: Product Behavior

The information in this specification is applicable to the following Microsoft products or supplemental software. References to product versions include released service packs.

Note: Some of the information in this section is subject to change because it applies to a preliminary product version, and thus may differ from the final version of the software when released. All behavior notes that pertain to the preliminary product version contain specific references to it as an aid to the reader.

- Windows XP operating system Service Pack 2 (SP2)
- Windows Server 2003 operating system with Service Pack 1 (SP1)
- Windows Vista operating system
- Windows Server 2008 operating system
- Windows 7 operating system
- Windows Server 2008 R2 operating system
- Windows 8 operating system
- Windows Server 2012 operating system
- Windows 8.1 operating system
- Windows Server 2012 R2 operating system
- Windows 10 operating system
- Windows Server 2016 Technical Preview operating system

Exceptions, if any, are noted below. If a service pack or Quick Fix Engineering (QFE) number appears with the product version, behavior changed in that service pack or QFE. The new behavior also applies to subsequent service packs of the product unless otherwise specified. If a product edition appears with the product version, behavior is different in that product edition.

Unless otherwise specified, any statement of optional behavior in this specification that is prescribed using the terms SHOULD or SHOULD NOT implies product behavior in accordance with the SHOULD or SHOULD NOT prescription. Unless otherwise specified, the term MAY implies that the product does not follow the prescription.

<1> Section 2.2.1: The Windows Web Services API element provides a buffered and streaming programming model for exchanging and processing SOAP messages encoded as specified in [SOAP-MTOM] between network nodes. When the Windows Web Services API's streaming programming model is used to create SOAP messages, it follows the MIME parts ordering requirements specified in section 2.2.1.

7 Change Tracking

No table of changes is available. The document is either new or has had no changes since its last release.

Applicability 6 Capability negotiation 6 Change tracking 13 Ε Examples - MIME multipart/related XOP package ordering 10 F Fields - vendor-extensible 7 G **Glossary** 5 Ι Implementer - security considerations 11 Index of security parameters 11 <u>Informative references</u> 6 <u>Introduction</u> 5 М Messages syntax 8 transport 8 MIME multipart/related XOP package ordering example 10 MIME parts - ordering of in multipart/related XOP package extension 6 in XOP packages 8 Normative references 5 Overview (synopsis) 6 Parameters - security index 11 Preconditions 6 Prerequisites 6 Product behavior 12 Protocol Details 9 overview 9 R

Index

8

Relationship to other protocols 6 S Security implementer considerations 11 parameter index 11 Standards assignments 7 Syntax 8 Т **Tracking changes** 13 **Transport** 8 V Vendor-extensible fields 7 Versioning 6

normative 5

References 5 informative 6