

# Resumable Uploads

**draft-ietf-httpbis-resumable-upload**

IETF 117: July 26, 2023

Jonathan Flat

# Implementation

tusdotnet server

NIOResumableUpload server

URLSession client on Apple platforms

# Server implementation observations

Two approaches:

1. Additional service defines a resumable upload, then sends the complete upload to a backend service
2. Additional service handles resumption by wrapping backend logic

Feedback from those with backend integration experience?

# Upload-Complete header field ([#2500](#))

Use Upload-Complete instead of Upload-Incomplete (current)

Client:

- Upload-Complete: ?1 This request completes the upload
- Upload-Complete: ?0 This request does not complete the upload

Server:

- Upload-Complete: ?1 The upload is complete
- Upload-Complete: ?0 The upload is not complete

Symmetric, so server can simply echo the field on success

# Upload-Complete header field ([#2500](#))

Discussion:

- Can we lock down `Upload-Complete` as the preferred name?
- Other thoughts on symmetric vs. asymmetric naming?

# Multi-version support ([#2597](#))

Current:

- Client sends the version it supports (e.g. `Upload-Draft-Interop-Version: 3`)
- Server advertises resumable upload if it supports that version

What if the client updates to a newer version than the server?

- Client loses resumable upload capability

Can we make this transition smoother as the draft evolves?

# Multi-version support ([#2597](#))

Discussion:

- Interest in solving this multi-version issue?
- Insight/experience with draft versioning like this?

# Adopting byte range PATCH ([#2501](#))

**draft-wright-http-patch-byterange** (call for adoption in HTTPAPI)

Eliminates the need for an `Upload-Offset` field

## Upload Appending Procedure

- `Upload-Offset: 50` becomes `Content-Range: bytes 50-199/200`
- If `Content-Length` is unknown, then `Content-Range: bytes 50-/*`

## Offset Retrieving Procedure

- Server responds with `Content-Length: 50`

# Adopting byte range PATCH ([#2501](#))

Discussion:

- Thoughts on adopting byte range PATCH?
- Do we want to depend on a draft in another WG?

# Upload progress via informational responses ([#2291](#))

Server could send multiple 1xx responses with the current `Upload-Offset`

Allows the client to release memory associated with the transmitted data

Discussion:

- Should this be included in the draft?

# Fetch API proposal (WHATWG [#1626](#))

Opened issue in `whatwg/fetch`

- Asked for feedback on the draft
- Proposed integration with the Fetch API

Labeled "needs implementer interest"

# Other open issues

- Error handling for Upload Creation Procedure ([#2596](#))
- Server should reject upload resumptions with inconsistent Content-Length ([#2544](#))
- How to get the response after upload is complete ([#2312](#))
- Resumable upload with forms? ([#2247](#))
- Prioritization of concurrent uploads ([#2242](#))