CALCONNECT THE CALENDARING & SCHEDULING CONSORTIUM

CALCONNECT DOCUMENT CD1009

Type:	**Report**
Title:	**May 2010 CalConnect Interoperability Test Event Report**
Version:	**1.0**
Date:	**2010-07-19**
Status:	**Published**
Source:	**IOPTEST**

This document incorporates by reference the CalConnect Intellectual Property Rights, Appropriate Usage, Trademarks and Disclaimer of Warranty for External (Public) Documents as located at

http://www.calconnect.org/documents/disclaimerpublic.pdf.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction

The June 2010 CalConnect Interoperability Testing Event was actually two distinct sets of testing. One set of vendors tested CalDAV and CardDAV. The second set of vendors tested mobile calendaring devices. The first section will detail the CalDAV and CardDAV results. The second section will detail the mobile testing results.

CalDAV and CardDAV Participants

Organization	Participants	Versions Tested
Apple	Cyrus Daboo	iCal Server and client - OS X 10.6.1 Apple iCal 4.0 (SnowLeopard)
Genentech	Monica Kumar	None (participant observer)
Icewarp	Filip Nsvara	eM Client 2.7.7402
Kerio		(server tested remotely)

Findings

During the testing, as usual minor issues were found and fixed. In particular a question arose as to the interpretation of text in the WebDAV ACL spec surrounding what clients need to send in an ACL request. Follow-up discussion is needed on that topic.

The CalDAV specification has been tested quite extensively over the last several interoperability tests. Therefore, recent events had tested either problematic areas or have focused on new portions of the specification such as sync reports.

The newer CardDAV specification also was tested. There is only a small subset of tests for the specification as it is still evolving.

The following outlines findings and observations found during testing:

The WebDAV ACL RFC is not ambiguous on whether protected ACEs should be sent when the ACL HTTP verb is used to change the access control list on a resource. There was discussion on whether or not protected ACEs and inherited ACEs should be sent. If a client doesn't send inherited ACEs, but sends protected ones, this results in errors reported by the server. This is the area that requires further discussion.

Rountrip of X- properties results in the X- properties being put into NOTE property as a text value.

Some implicit scheduling was tested between normal and calendar users and a resource.

PUTs of events on URIs that don't have the resource name in the <UID>.ics format result in 302 redirect response.

vCard fields (NAME, FN, X-AIM, X-JABBER)

Testing was performed on the CardDAV server with two clients accessing the address book. The interpretation of certain vCard fields differed between the clients.

One client incorrectly used the FN and NAME properties, where the FN value was stored in NAME property and the other value shouldn't have been used at all. Some vCard 4 properties (eg. KIND) were also generated even though the server announced only vCard 3 support.

If custom X-AIM and X-JABBER properties are used for IM information, client cannot understand and resolve them. It is suggested that standard IMPP properties be used instead.

Mobile Calendar Testing

This was the third Mobile Calendaring Interoperability test event. The primary focus was Activesync and the CalConnect Mobile Calendar Interoperability Test suite was used as the basis for testing. A copy of the test suite can be found in the resources section of the CalConnect website.

The test suite is quite large. In order to ensure we tested as much as possible during the three days, a subset of the test suite was chosen. A testing matrix was used as a guide and to record findings.   In addition, a matrix of tested components was used to record results. A completed test matrix with the results from all testing vendors is included at the end of this report.

The testing included calendar (vEvent), tasks (vTodo) and contacts (vCard. The number of items tested was as follows:

	# of test cases
Calendar Test Results	
Easy	24
Medium	42
Hard	17
Total calendar tests - 83	
Task Test Results	14
Contact Test Results	14
Total of all tests	111

Participants

The participants in the testing were as follows:

Mobile Interop Testing		
Organization	**Contact**	**What was tested**
Icewarp	Alexej Eremias	Server
MailSite	John Davies	Server and Client (AstraSync 4.1.13)
	Amit Patel	
Microsoft	Kiran Nallabothula	Server and Client
Nokia	Alvaro Manera	Client
	Andrey Moiseenko	
Notify Technology	Rhonda Chicone	Client
	Ben King	
	Tony Groover	
Synchronica	Tino Schultze	Server
CalConnect Reps		
Interop Manager Logistics	Pat Egen Dave Thewlis	

Findings

Because Activesync is a specification that has been around for awhile, many items tested worked well. Much of what is noted here are the areas where issues were found.

Timezones caused problems on several devices.

The Getitemestimate command was found to not be supported on several servers. This caused an issue as several clients required support.

Some servers will report that they support a specific version of ActiveSync but will then send a different version data to the device.

Some devices do not send 'user=' string with HTTP POST command. This is probably caused by different interpretations of the ActiveSync spec.

Several devices received an error 400 from various servers. Again, this issue is a different interpretation of the specification. It is ambiguous with regards to parameters. Some vendors have interpreted a parameter as a MUST and others as a SHOULD.

RDATES are not supported on many devices and servers.

General Overall Summary

Activesync is a protocol that has been around a while and is in heavy usage. This was evidenced by the fact that much of the testing of normal operations passed.

It was noted that several server had issues with GETITEMESTIMATE. This may be due, in part, to ambiguities in the specification. This should be added to the "check next time" testing requirements for our future mobile interoperability testing.

Across the board, the test items including RRules were either not tested or failed.

General feedback was the event overall was useful for talking to other vendors in industry and discussing common issues. The server/client testing matrix was useful to define some structure to the event without being too restrictive.

Our thanks to all participants and contributors to this document.

Respectfully submitted by Pat Egen, CalConnect Interop Manager.