

[MS-METAWEB]:

MetaWeblog Extensions Protocol

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 iplg@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
4/4/2008	0.1	New	Initial Availability
6/27/2008	1.0	Major	Revised and edited the technical content
12/12/2008	1.01	Editorial	Revised and edited the technical content
7/13/2009	1.02	Major	Changes made for template compliance
8/28/2009	1.03	Editorial	Revised and edited the technical content
11/6/2009	1.04	Editorial	Revised and edited the technical content
2/19/2010	2.0	Editorial	Revised and edited the technical content
3/31/2010	2.01	Editorial	Revised and edited the technical content
4/30/2010	2.02	Editorial	Revised and edited the technical content
6/7/2010	2.03	Editorial	Revised and edited the technical content
6/29/2010	2.04	Editorial	Changed language and formatting in the technical content.
7/23/2010	2.05	Editorial	Changed language and formatting in the technical content.
9/27/2010	2.05	None	No changes to the meaning, language, or formatting of the technical content.
11/15/2010	2.05	None	No changes to the meaning, language, or formatting of the technical content.
12/17/2010	2.05	None	No changes to the meaning, language, or formatting of the technical content.
3/18/2011	2.05	None	No changes to the meaning, language, or formatting of the technical content.
6/10/2011	2.05	None	No changes to the meaning, language, or formatting of the technical content.
1/20/2012	2.6	Minor	Clarified the meaning of the technical content.
4/11/2012	2.6	None	No changes to the meaning, language, or formatting of the technical content.
7/16/2012	2.7	Minor	Clarified the meaning of the technical content.
9/12/2012	2.7	None	No changes to the meaning, language, or formatting of the technical content.
10/8/2012	2.7	None	No changes to the meaning, language, or formatting of the technical content.
2/11/2013	2.7	None	No changes to the meaning, language, or formatting of the technical content.
7/30/2013	2.7	None	No changes to the meaning, language, or formatting of the technical content.
11/18/2013	2.8	Minor	Clarified the meaning of the technical content.

Date	Revision History	Revision Class	Comments
2/10/2014	2.8	None	No changes to the meaning, language, or formatting of the technical content.
4/30/2014	2.8	None	No changes to the meaning, language, or formatting of the technical content.
7/31/2014	2.8	None	No changes to the meaning, language, or formatting of the technical content.
10/30/2014	2.8	None	No changes to the meaning, language, or formatting of the technical content.
3/16/2015	3.0	Major	Significantly changed the technical content.
2/26/2016	4.0	Major	Significantly changed the technical content.

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	5
1.1	Glossary	5
1.2	References	5
1.2.1	Normative References	5
1.2.2	Informative References	6
1.3	Overview	6
1.4	Relationship to Other Protocols	6
1.5	Prerequisites/Preconditions	6
1.6	Applicability Statement	6
1.7	Versioning and Capability Negotiation	6
1.8	Vendor-Extensible Fields	7
1.9	Standards Assignments.....	7
2	Messages.....	8
2.1	Transport	8
2.2	Message Syntax.....	8
2.2.1	metaWeblog.newPost Extension	8
2.2.2	metaWeblog.editPost Extension	8
2.2.3	metaWeblog.getPost Extension.....	9
2.2.4	metaWeblog.newMediaObject Extension	9
2.2.5	metaWeblog.getCategories Extension.....	9
2.2.6	metaWeblog.getRecentPosts Extension.....	10
2.2.7	blogger.getUsersBlogs Extension	10
3	Protocol Details	11
3.1	Common Details	11
3.1.1	Abstract Data Model.....	11
3.1.2	Timers	11
3.1.3	Initialization	11
3.1.4	Higher-Layer Triggered Events	11
3.1.5	Message Processing Events and Sequencing Rules	11
3.1.6	Timer Events.....	11
3.1.7	Other Local Events.....	11
4	Protocol Examples	12
4.1	Client Messages	12
4.1.1	metaWeblog.newPost	12
5	Security	14
5.1	Security Considerations for Implementers	14
5.2	Index of Security Parameters	14
6	Appendix A: XML-RPC Schema.....	15
7	Appendix B: Product Behavior	17
8	Change Tracking.....	20
9	Index.....	22

1 Introduction

The MetaWeblog Extensions Protocol is a set of extensions to the MetaWeblog API to enable more secure authentication mechanisms.

Sections 1.5, 1.8, 1.9, 2, and 3 of this specification are normative. All other sections and examples in this specification are informative.

1.1 Glossary

This document uses the following terms:

blog: A website that contains a series of posts about a subject and is arranged in reverse chronological order. Also referred to as web log.

category: A custom string that is used to group one or more documents.

Hypertext Transfer Protocol (HTTP): An application-level protocol for distributed, collaborative, hypermedia information systems (text, graphic images, sound, video, and other multimedia files) on the World Wide Web.

NT LAN Manager (NTLM) Authentication Protocol: A protocol using a challenge-response mechanism for authentication (2) in which clients are able to verify their identities without sending a password to the server. It consists of three messages, commonly referred to as Type 1 (negotiation), Type 2 (challenge) and Type 3 (authentication). For more information, see [\[MS-NLMP\]](#).

server: A computer on which the remote procedure call (RPC) server is executing.

Unicode: A character encoding standard developed by the Unicode Consortium that represents almost all of the written languages of the world. The **Unicode** standard [\[UNICODE5.0.0/2007\]](#) provides three forms (UTF-8, UTF-16, and UTF-32) and seven schemes (UTF-8, UTF-16, UTF-16 BE, UTF-16 LE, UTF-32, UTF-32 LE, and UTF-32 BE).

XML: The Extensible Markup Language, as described in [\[XML1.0\]](#).

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.

[Blogger API] Williams, E., "Blogger API", August 2001, http://www.blogger.com/developers/api/1_docs/

[MS-NTHT] Microsoft Corporation, "[NTLM Over HTTP Protocol](#)".

[RFC-MWA] Winer, D., "RFC: MetaWeblog API", March 2002, <http://www.xmlrpc.com/metaWeblogApi>

[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>

[RFC2616] Fielding, R., Gettys, J., Mogul, J., et al., "Hypertext Transfer Protocol -- HTTP/1.1", RFC 2616, June 1999, <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc2616.txt>

[XML-RPC] Winer, D., "XML-RPC Specification", June 1999, <http://www.xmlrpc.com/spec>

1.2.2 Informative References

[MS-NLMP] Microsoft Corporation, "[NT LAN Manager \(NTLM\) Authentication Protocol](#)".

[RFC2617] Franks, J., Hallam-Baker, P., Hostetler, J., et al., "HTTP Authentication: Basic and Digest Access Authentication", RFC 2617, June 1999, <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc2617.txt>

1.3 Overview

The RFC: MetaWeblog API, as described in [\[RFC-MWA\]](#), is a protocol that allows client software to get and set the text and attributes of posts on a **blog**. The RFC: MetaWeblog API uses the **XML-RPC** communication protocol, as described in [\[XML-RPC\]](#), for communication between client applications and a blog **server**. The client sends XML-RPC method call requests to the server, and the server returns a response to the client. The server never initiates any communication with the client.

This protocol extends the RFC: MetaWeblog API to enable the client sending empty usernames and passwords in MetaWeblog API methods, and the server authenticating blog users with other mechanisms in the underlying transport. A typical scenario is that a blog (1) user wants to add a new post to a blog, and the client software sends a method request with empty username and password parameters.

1.4 Relationship to Other Protocols

This protocol is a set of extensions to the RFC: MetaWeblog API that enables the server to use other authentication methods. The RFC: MetaWeblog API is an extension of the Blogger API, as described in [\[Blogger API\]](#). Therefore, many blog tools and editors that support the RFC: MetaWeblog API also support the Blogger API.

1.5 Prerequisites/Preconditions

It is assumed that a MetaWeblog client has obtained the name of a server that supports the RFC: MetaWeblog API before this protocol is invoked.

The protocol server endpoint is formed by appending "_layouts/metaweblog.aspx" to the URL of the blog site; for example, http://www.example.com/_layouts/metaweblog.aspx.

1.6 Applicability Statement

The RFC: MetaWeblog API is applicable wherever there is a need to get and set the text and attributes of posts on a blog. This protocol extension is applicable when a client using the RFC: MetaWeblog API does not send the user's name and password directly in the messages, but rather uses the authentication performed by an underlying transport.

1.7 Versioning and Capability Negotiation

This document covers versioning issues in the following areas:

- **Supported Transports:** This protocol can only be implemented using **Hypertext Transfer Protocol (HTTP)**, as described in section [2.1](#).

Security and Authentication Methods: The MetaWeblog API methods each contain a *username* and a *password* parameter for user authentication purposes. Some MetaWeblog servers also support alternate authentication methods such as **NT LAN Manager (NTLM) Authentication Protocol**, as described in [\[MS-NLMP\]](#), and HTTP authentication, as described in [\[RFC2617\]](#).

1.8 Vendor-Extensible Fields

None.

1.9 Standards Assignments

None.

2 Messages

2.1 Transport

A MetaWeblog message is an HTTP version 1.1 POST request, as specified in [\[RFC2616\]](#). The body of the request is in XML. A procedure executes on the server, and the response that is returned is formatted in XML.

2.2 Message Syntax

The format of the XML body for an XML-RPC request and response is specified in [\[XML-RPC\]](#). The body of the request and response is in XML using **Unicode** string.

The format of the method request and response for each MetaWeblog method is specified in [\[RFC-MWA\]](#).

The Blogger API functions are specified in [\[Blogger API\]](#).

Each method in the MetaWeblog API provides *username* and *password* parameters for authenticating the blog user with the server. If the server is capable of authenticating the user by using the authentication methods described in section [1.7](#), these parameters are not necessary and a client SHOULD [<1><2>](#) pass them as empty elements.

2.2.1 metaWeblog.newPost Extension

The **metaWeblog.newPost** method posts a new entry to a blog. The structure of this method, as specified in [\[RFC-MWA\]](#), is as follows.

```
public string metaWeblog.newPost(string blogid,  
    string username,  
    string password,  
    struct struct,  
    bool publish);
```

The use of the following parameters differs from that which is specified in [\[RFC-MWA\]](#).

username: An XML-encoded Unicode string that contains the login for the blog user, which SHOULD [<3>](#) be empty.

password: An XML-encoded Unicode string that contains the user's password, which SHOULD [<4>](#) be empty.

2.2.2 metaWeblog.editPost Extension

The **metaWeblog.editPost** method edits an existing entry on a blog. The structure of this method, as specified in [\[RFC-MWA\]](#), is as follows.

```
public bool metaWeblog.editPost(string postid,  
    string username,  
    string password,  
    struct struct,  
    bool publish);
```

The use of the following parameters differs from that which is specified in [\[RFC-MWA\]](#).

username: An XML-encoded Unicode string containing the login for the blog user, which SHOULD [<5>](#) be empty.

password: An XML-encoded Unicode string containing the user's password, which SHOULD [<6>](#) be empty.

2.2.3 metaWeblog.getPost Extension

The **metaWeblog.getPost** method returns a specific entry from a blog. The structure of this method, as specified in [\[RFC-MWA\]](#), is as follows.

```
public struct metaWeblog.getPost(string postid,  
    string username,  
    string password);
```

The use of the following parameters differs from that which is specified in [\[RFC-MWA\]](#).

username: An XML-encoded Unicode string containing the login for the blog user, which SHOULD [<7>](#) be empty.

password: An XML-encoded Unicode string containing the user's password, which SHOULD [<8>](#) be empty.

2.2.4 metaWeblog.newMediaObject Extension

The **metaWeblog.newMediaObject** method uploads a file from a user's computer to the user's blog. [<9>](#) The structure of this method, as specified in [\[RFC-MWA\]](#), is as follows.

```
public struct metaWeblog.newMediaObject(string blogid,  
    string username,  
    string password,  
    struct struct);
```

The use of the following parameters differs from that which is specified in [\[RFC-MWA\]](#).

username: An XML-encoded Unicode string containing the login for the blog user, which SHOULD [<10>](#) be empty.

password: An XML-encoded Unicode string containing the user's password, which SHOULD [<11>](#) be empty.

2.2.5 metaWeblog.getCategories Extension

The **metaWeblog.getCategories** method returns the list of **categories** that have been used in the blog. The structure of this method, as specified in [\[RFC-MWA\]](#), is as follows.

```
public struct[] metaWeblog.getCategories(string blogid,  
    string username,  
    string password);
```

The use of the following parameters differs from that which is specified in [\[RFC-MWA\]](#).

username: An XML encoded Unicode string containing the login for the blog user, which SHOULD [<12>](#) be empty.

password: An XML encoded Unicode string containing the user's password, which SHOULD [<13>](#) be empty.

2.2.6 metaWeblog.getRecentPosts Extension

The **metaWeblog.getRecentPosts** method returns the most recent draft and non-draft blog posts in descending order by publish date. The structure of this method, as specified in [\[RFC-MWA\]](#), is as follows.

```
public struct[] metaWeblog.getRecentPosts(string blogid,  
    string username,  
    string password,  
    int numberOfPosts);
```

The use of the following parameters differs from that which is specified in [\[RFC-MWA\]](#).

username: An XML encoded Unicode string containing the login for the blog user, which SHOULD [<14>](#) be empty.

password: An XML encoded Unicode string containing the user's password, which SHOULD [<15>](#) be empty.

2.2.7 blogger.getUsersBlogs Extension

The **blogger.getUsersBlogs** method returns a list of blogs to which the current authenticated user has posting privileges. The structure of this method, as specified in [\[Blogger API\]](#), is as follows.

```
public struct[] blogger.getUsersBlogs(string appkey,  
    string username,  
    string password);
```

The use of the following parameters differs from that which is specified in [\[Blogger API\]](#).

username: An XML-encoded Unicode string containing the login for the blog user, which SHOULD [<16>](#) be empty.

password: An XML-encoded Unicode string containing the user's password, which SHOULD [<17>](#) be empty.

3 Protocol Details

3.1 Common Details

3.1.1 Abstract Data Model

The abstract data model follows the specifications in [\[RFC-MWA\]](#) and [\[XML-RPC\]](#).

3.1.2 Timers

None.

3.1.3 Initialization

None.

3.1.4 Higher-Layer Triggered Events

None.

3.1.5 Message Processing Events and Sequencing Rules

When the server receives a protocol message containing an empty *username* or an empty *password*, the server MUST ensure that authentication has been established through some other mechanism compatible with the HTTP transport, as specified in [\[RFC2616\]](#), before performing the requested action. [<18>](#)

If the authentication through other mechanism fails to authenticate a blog user to the MetaWeblog service, an error MUST be returned as an XML-RPC <methodResponse> with a <fault> item, as specified in [\[XML-RPC\]](#). If the authentication through another mechanism succeeds in authenticating the blog user, the server MUST perform the requested action and return a response, as specified in [\[RFC-MWA\]](#).

3.1.6 Timer Events

None.

3.1.7 Other Local Events

None.

4 Protocol Examples

4.1 Client Messages

Each method, as described in [\[RFC-MWA\]](#), follows a similar request and response pattern. The following example demonstrates a request with empty *username* and *password* parameters.

4.1.1 metaWeblog.newPost

When a blog user adds a new post to a blog, the client software will send a **metaWeblog.newPost** request, as described in [\[XML-RPC\]](#), with a body formatted as XML as follows.

```
<?xml version="1.0" encoding="UTF-8"?>
<methodCall>
  <methodName>metaWeblog.newPost</methodName>
  <params>
    <param>
      <value>
        <string>MyBlog</string>
      </value>
    </param>
    <param>
      <value>
        <string></string>
      </value>
    </param>
    <param>
      <value>
        <string></string>
      </value>
    </param>
    <param>
      <value>
        <struct>
          <member>
            <name>title</name>
            <value>
              <string>My Title</string>
            </value>
          </member>
          <member>
            <name>description</name>
            <value>
              <string>My description</string>
            </value>
          </member>
          <member>
            <name>categories</name>
            <value>
              <array>
                <data>
                  <value>
                    <string>My Category</string>
                  </value>
                </data>
              </array>
            </value>
          </member>
        </struct>
      </value>
    </param>
    <param>
      <value>
        <boolean>1</boolean>
      </value>
    </param>
  </params>
</methodCall>
```

```
        </value>
      </param>
    </params>
  </methodCall>
```

The server processes the **metaWeblog.newPost** method request and returns a response, as described in [XML-RPC], with a body formatted as XML as follows.

```
<?xml version="1.0" encoding="UTF-8"?>
<methodResponse>
  <params>
    <param>
      <value>1829</value>
    </param>
  </params>
</methodResponse>
```

5 Security

5.1 Security Considerations for Implementers

The protocol described in [\[RFC-MWA\]](#) uses HTTP version 1.1 as its transport mechanism. The security considerations for HTTP 1.1 are described in [\[RFC2616\]](#), section 15.

The protocols described in [\[Blogger API\]](#) and [\[RFC-MWA\]](#) use clear-text *username* and *password* parameters for authentication. This makes the protocol vulnerable to replay attacks, and permits the recovery of the user's password via the recording of client and server protocol exchanges.

The vulnerabilities of the RFC: MetaWeblog API can be mitigated by relying on authentication methods in the underlying transport such as the NTLM Over HTTP protocol, as described in [\[MS-NTHT\]](#) or in [\[RFC2617\]](#), and by sending empty *username* and *password* parameters in the message, as described in [\[RFC-MWA\]](#).

5.2 Index of Security Parameters

None.

6 Appendix A: XML-RPC Schema

For ease of implementation the following XML-RPC Schema is provided.

```
<?xml version="1.0"?>
<xsd:schema xmlns:xsd="http://www.w3.org/2001/XMLSchema">

  <xsd:element name="methodCall">
    <xsd:complexType>
      <xsd:all>
        <xsd:element name="methodName">
          <xsd:simpleType>
            <xsd:restriction base="ASCIIString">
              <xsd:pattern value="([A-Za-z0-9]||\.|_|_)*" />
            </xsd:restriction>
          </xsd:simpleType>
        </xsd:element>
        <xsd:element name="params" minOccurs="0" maxOccurs="1">
          <xsd:complexType>
            <xsd:sequence>
              <xsd:element name="param" type="ParamType"
                minOccurs="0" maxOccurs="unbounded" />
            </xsd:sequence>
          </xsd:complexType>
        </xsd:element>
      </xsd:all>
    </xsd:complexType>
  </xsd:element>

  <xsd:element name="methodResponse">
    <xsd:complexType>
      <xsd:choice>
        <xsd:element name="params">
          <xsd:complexType>
            <xsd:sequence>
              <xsd:element name="param" type="ParamType" />
            </xsd:sequence>
          </xsd:complexType>
        </xsd:element>
        <xsd:element name="fault">
          <xsd:complexType>
            <xsd:sequence>
              <xsd:element name="value">
                <xsd:complexType>
                  <xsd:sequence>
                    <xsd:element name="struct">
                      <xsd:complexType>
                        <xsd:sequence>
                          <xsd:element name="member"
                            type="MemberType" />
                          <xsd:element name="member"
                            type="MemberType" />
                        </xsd:sequence>
                      </xsd:complexType>
                    </xsd:element>
                  </xsd:sequence>
                </xsd:complexType>
              </xsd:element>
            </xsd:sequence>
          </xsd:complexType>
        </xsd:element>
      </xsd:choice>
    </xsd:complexType>
  </xsd:element>

  <xsd:complexType name="ParamType">
    <xsd:sequence>
```

```

    <xsd:element name="value" type="ValueType" />
  </xsd:sequence>
</xsd:complexType>

<xsd:complexType name="ValueType" mixed="true">
  <xsd:choice>
    <xsd:element name="i4" type="xsd:int" />
    <xsd:element name="int" type="xsd:int" />
    <xsd:element name="string" type="ASCIIString" />
    <xsd:element name="double" type="xsd:decimal" />
    <xsd:element name="Base64" type="xsd:base64Binary" />
    <xsd:element name="boolean" type="NumericBoolean" />
    <xsd:element name="dateTime.iso8601" type="xsd:dateTime" />
    <xsd:element name="array" type="ArrayType" />
    <xsd:element name="struct" type="StructType" />
  </xsd:choice>
</xsd:complexType>

<xsd:complexType name="StructType">
  <xsd:sequence>
    <xsd:element name="member" type="MemberType"
      maxOccurs="unbounded" />
  </xsd:sequence>
</xsd:complexType>

<xsd:complexType name="MemberType">
  <xsd:sequence>
    <xsd:element name="name" type="xsd:string" />
    <xsd:element name="value" type="ValueType" />
  </xsd:sequence>
</xsd:complexType>

<xsd:complexType name="ArrayType">
  <xsd:sequence>
    <xsd:element name="data">
      <xsd:complexType>
        <xsd:sequence>
          <xsd:element name="value" type="ValueType"
            minOccurs="0" maxOccurs="unbounded" />
        </xsd:sequence>
      </xsd:complexType>
    </xsd:element>
  </xsd:sequence>
</xsd:complexType>

<xsd:simpleType name="ASCIIString">
  <xsd:restriction base="xsd:string">
    <xsd:pattern value="([ -~]|\n|\r|\t)*" />
  </xsd:restriction>
</xsd:simpleType>

<xsd:simpleType name="NumericBoolean">
  <xsd:restriction base="xsd:boolean">
    <xsd:pattern value="0|1" />
  </xsd:restriction>
</xsd:simpleType>
</xsd:schema>

```


7 Appendix B: 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.

- The 2007 Microsoft Office system
- Microsoft Office 2010 suites
- Microsoft Office 2013
- Microsoft Office SharePoint Server 2007
- Microsoft SharePoint Server 2010
- Windows SharePoint Services 3.0
- Microsoft SharePoint Foundation 2010
- Microsoft SharePoint Foundation 2013
- Microsoft Office Word 2007
- Microsoft Office 2016
- Microsoft SharePoint Server 2016

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](#): Office Word 2007 sends an empty *password* parameter when communicating with Office SharePoint Server 2007, SharePoint Server 2010, Windows SharePoint Services 3.0, SharePoint Foundation 2010. Office SharePoint Server 2007, SharePoint Server 2010, Windows SharePoint Services 3.0, SharePoint Foundation 2010 can be configured to allow a non-empty password, but by default it will send a failure response if the client sends a non-empty password.

[<2> Section 2.2](#): Office Word 2007 sends an empty *username* parameter when communicating with Office SharePoint Server 2007, SharePoint Server 2010, Windows SharePoint Services 3.0, SharePoint Foundation 2010. Office SharePoint Server 2007, SharePoint Server 2010, Windows SharePoint Services 3.0, SharePoint Foundation 2010 can be configured to allow a nonempty *username*, but by default it will send a failure response if the client sends a nonempty *username*.

[<3> Section 2.2.1](#): Office Word 2007 sends an empty *username* parameter when communicating with Office SharePoint Server 2007, SharePoint Server 2010, Windows SharePoint Services 3.0, SharePoint Foundation 2010. Office SharePoint Server 2007, SharePoint Server 2010, Windows SharePoint Services 3.0, SharePoint Foundation 2010 can be configured to allow a nonempty *username*, but by default it will send a failure response if the client sends a nonempty *username*.

[<4> Section 2.2.1](#): Office Word 2007 sends an empty *password* parameter when communicating with Office SharePoint Server 2007, SharePoint Server 2010, Windows SharePoint Services 3.0, SharePoint Foundation 2010. Office SharePoint Server 2007, SharePoint Server 2010, Windows SharePoint Services 3.0, SharePoint Foundation 2010 can be configured to allow a non-empty password, but by default it will send a failure response if the client sends a non-empty password.

<5> [Section 2.2.2](#): Office Word 2007 sends an empty *username* parameter when communicating with Office SharePoint Server 2007, SharePoint Server 2010, Windows SharePoint Services 3.0, SharePoint Foundation 2010. Office SharePoint Server 2007, SharePoint Server 2010, Windows SharePoint Services 3.0, SharePoint Foundation 2010 can be configured to allow a nonempty *username*, but by default it will send a failure response if the client sends a nonempty *username*.

<6> [Section 2.2.2](#): Office Word 2007 sends an empty *password* parameter when communicating with Office SharePoint Server 2007, SharePoint Server 2010, Windows SharePoint Services 3.0, SharePoint Foundation 2010. Office SharePoint Server 2007, SharePoint Server 2010, Windows SharePoint Services 3.0, SharePoint Foundation 2010 can be configured to allow a non-empty password, but by default it will send a failure response if the client sends a non-empty password.

<7> [Section 2.2.3](#): Office Word 2007 sends an empty *username* parameter when communicating with Office SharePoint Server 2007, SharePoint Server 2010, Windows SharePoint Services 3.0, SharePoint Foundation 2010. Office SharePoint Server 2007, SharePoint Server 2010, Windows SharePoint Services 3.0, SharePoint Foundation 2010 can be configured to allow a nonempty *username*, but by default it will send a failure response if the client sends a nonempty *username*.

<8> [Section 2.2.3](#): Office Word 2007 sends an empty *password* parameter when communicating with Office SharePoint Server 2007, SharePoint Server 2010, Windows SharePoint Services 3.0, SharePoint Foundation 2010. Office SharePoint Server 2007, SharePoint Server 2010, Windows SharePoint Services 3.0, SharePoint Foundation 2010 can be configured to allow a non-empty password, but by default it will send a failure response if the client sends a non-empty password.

<9> [Section 2.2.4](#): The `metaWeblog.newMediaObject` method is not supported on Office server and server will send a failure response if client calls this method.

<10> [Section 2.2.4](#): Office Word 2007 sends an empty *username* parameter when communicating with Office SharePoint Server 2007, SharePoint Server 2010, Windows SharePoint Services 3.0, SharePoint Foundation 2010. Office SharePoint Server 2007, SharePoint Server 2010, Windows SharePoint Services 3.0, SharePoint Foundation 2010 can be configured to allow a nonempty *username*, but by default it will send a failure response if the client sends a nonempty *username*.

<11> [Section 2.2.4](#): Office Word 2007 sends an empty *password* parameter when communicating with Office SharePoint Server 2007, SharePoint Server 2010, Windows SharePoint Services 3.0, SharePoint Foundation 2010. Office SharePoint Server 2007, SharePoint Server 2010, Windows SharePoint Services 3.0, SharePoint Foundation 2010 can be configured to allow a non-empty password, but by default it will send a failure response if the client sends a non-empty password.

<12> [Section 2.2.5](#): Office Word 2007 sends an empty *username* parameter when communicating with Office SharePoint Server 2007, SharePoint Server 2010, Windows SharePoint Services 3.0, SharePoint Foundation 2010. Office SharePoint Server 2007, SharePoint Server 2010, Windows SharePoint Services 3.0, SharePoint Foundation 2010 can be configured to allow a nonempty *username*, but by default it will send a failure response if the client sends a nonempty *username*.

<13> [Section 2.2.5](#): Office Word 2007 sends an empty *password* parameter when communicating with Office SharePoint Server 2007, SharePoint Server 2010, Windows SharePoint Services 3.0, SharePoint Foundation 2010. Office SharePoint Server 2007, SharePoint Server 2010, Windows SharePoint Services 3.0, SharePoint Foundation 2010 can be configured to allow a non-empty password, but by default it will send a failure response if the client sends a non-empty password.

<14> [Section 2.2.6](#): Office Word 2007 sends an empty *username* parameter when communicating with Office SharePoint Server 2007, SharePoint Server 2010, Windows SharePoint Services 3.0, SharePoint Foundation 2010. Office SharePoint Server 2007, SharePoint Server 2010, Windows SharePoint Services 3.0, SharePoint Foundation 2010 can be configured to allow a nonempty *username*, but by default it will send a failure response if the client sends a nonempty *username*.

<15> [Section 2.2.6](#): Office Word 2007 sends an empty *password* parameter when communicating with Office SharePoint Server 2007, SharePoint Server 2010, Windows SharePoint Services 3.0, SharePoint Foundation 2010. Office SharePoint Server 2007, SharePoint Server 2010, Windows

SharePoint Services 3.0, SharePoint Foundation 2010 can be configured to allow a non-empty password, but by default it will send a failure response if the client sends a non-empty password.

<16> [Section 2.2.7](#): Office Word 2007 sends an empty *username* parameter when communicating with Office SharePoint Server 2007, SharePoint Server 2010, Windows SharePoint Services 3.0, SharePoint Foundation 2010. Office SharePoint Server 2007, SharePoint Server 2010, Windows SharePoint Services 3.0, SharePoint Foundation 2010 can be configured to allow a nonempty *username*, but by default it will send a failure response if the client sends a nonempty *username*.

<17> [Section 2.2.7](#): Office Word 2007 sends an empty *password* parameter when communicating with Office SharePoint Server 2007, SharePoint Server 2010, Windows SharePoint Services 3.0, SharePoint Foundation 2010. Office SharePoint Server 2007, SharePoint Server 2010, Windows SharePoint Services 3.0, SharePoint Foundation 2010 can be configured to allow a non-empty password, but by default it will send a failure response if the client sends a non-empty password.

<18> [Section 3.1.5](#): Office SharePoint Server 2007 authenticates blog users using [\[MS-NTHT\]](#).

8 Change Tracking

This section identifies changes that were made to this document since the last release. Changes are classified as New, Major, Minor, Editorial, or No change.

The revision class **New** means that a new document is being released.

The revision class **Major** means that the technical content in the document was significantly revised. Major changes affect protocol interoperability or implementation. Examples of major changes are:

- A document revision that incorporates changes to interoperability requirements or functionality.
- The removal of a document from the documentation set.

The revision class **Minor** means that the meaning of the technical content was clarified. Minor changes do not affect protocol interoperability or implementation. Examples of minor changes are updates to clarify ambiguity at the sentence, paragraph, or table level.

The revision class **Editorial** means that the formatting in the technical content was changed. Editorial changes apply to grammatical, formatting, and style issues.

The revision class **No change** means that no new technical changes were introduced. Minor editorial and formatting changes may have been made, but the technical content of the document is identical to the last released version.

Major and minor changes can be described further using the following change types:

- New content added.
- Content updated.
- Content removed.
- New product behavior note added.
- Product behavior note updated.
- Product behavior note removed.
- New protocol syntax added.
- Protocol syntax updated.
- Protocol syntax removed.
- New content added due to protocol revision.
- Content updated due to protocol revision.
- Content removed due to protocol revision.
- New protocol syntax added due to protocol revision.
- Protocol syntax updated due to protocol revision.
- Protocol syntax removed due to protocol revision.
- Obsolete document removed.

Editorial changes are always classified with the change type **Editorially updated**.

Some important terms used in the change type descriptions are defined as follows:

- **Protocol syntax** refers to data elements (such as packets, structures, enumerations, and methods) as well as interfaces.
- **Protocol revision** refers to changes made to a protocol that affect the bits that are sent over the wire.

The changes made to this document are listed in the following table. For more information, please contact dochelp@microsoft.com.

Section	Tracking number (if applicable) and description	Major change (Y or N)	Change type
Z Appendix B: Product Behavior	Updated list of supported products.	Y	Content updated due to protocol revision.
7 Appendix B: Product Behavior	Updated list of supported products.	Y	Content updated due to protocol revision.

9 Index

A

[Abstract data model](#) 11
[Applicability](#) 6

B

[blogger.getUsersBlogs Extension message](#) 10

C

[Capability negotiation](#) 6
[Change tracking](#) 20
[Client message example](#) 12

D

[Data model - abstract](#) 11

E

Examples
[client message](#) 12
[metaWeblog.newPost](#) 12

F

[Fields - vendor-extensible](#) 7
[Full XML schema](#) 15

G

[Glossary](#) 5

H

[Higher-layer triggered events](#) 11

I

[Implementer - security considerations](#) 14
[Index of security parameters](#) 14
[Informative references](#) 6
[Initialization](#) 11
[Introduction](#) 5

L

[Local events](#) 11

M

[Message processing events](#) 11
Messages
[blogger.getUsersBlogs Extension](#) 10
[metaWeblog.editPost Extension](#) 8
[metaWeblog.getCategories Extension](#) 9
[metaWeblog.getPost Extension](#) 9
[metaWeblog.getRecentPosts Extension](#) 10
[metaWeblog.newMediaObject Extension](#) 9

[metaWeblog.newPost Extension](#) 8
[syntax](#) 8
[transport](#) 8
[metaWeblog.editPost Extension message](#) 8
[metaWeblog.getCategories Extension message](#) 9
[metaWeblog.getPost Extension message](#) 9
[metaWeblog.getRecentPosts Extension message](#) 10
[metaWeblog.newMediaObject Extension message](#) 9
[metaWeblog.newPost example](#) 12
[metaWeblog.newPost Extension message](#) 8

N

[Normative references](#) 5

O

[Overview \(synopsis\)](#) 6

P

[Parameters - security index](#) 14
[Preconditions](#) 6
[Prerequisites](#) 6
[Product behavior](#) 17

R

[References](#) 5
[informative](#) 6
[normative](#) 5
[Relationship to other protocols](#) 6

S

Security
[implementer considerations](#) 14
[parameter index](#) 14
[Sequencing rules](#) 11
[Standards assignments](#) 7
Syntax
[messages - overview](#) 8

T

[Timer events](#) 11
[Timers](#) 11
[Tracking changes](#) 20
[Transport](#) 8
[Triggered events - higher layer](#) 11

V

[Vendor-extensible fields](#) 7
[Versioning](#) 6

X

[XML schema](#) 15