

JSON binding of IODEF

draft-ietf-mile-jsoniodef-04.txt

<https://github.com/milewg/draft-ietf-mile-jsoniodef>

Takeshi Takahashi, Roman Danyliw, and Mio Suzuki

Current status of the draft

1. We agreed to use CDDL (instead of JSON schema) to define the structure of IODEF document in London, thus we defined the data model in CDDL in the 04 version of the draft
2. This talk summarizes some notes we had better share in this WG

Note 1:

CDDL was used instead of JSON schema for defining the data model

Changes to the draft

1. The data model is now defined in CDDL in Section 5
2. The data model in JSON schema is moved to Appendix A

Status of the data model definition languages

1. CDDL is expected to be published as an RFC after a couple of minor revisions
2. The standardization direction of JSON schema is not yet clear to me

Coping with some errata

1. The errata needs to be reflected if these are accepted.

```
+-----+  
| AlternativeIndicatorID |  
+-----+  
| ENUM restriction      |<>--{1..*}--[ IndicatorID ]  
| STRING ext-restriction |  
+-----+
```

Current text:
IndicatorReference



Figure 61: The AlternativeIndicatorID Class

The type of VulkObservableList@BulkObservable

Definition in RFC7970:

One. STRING. A list of observables, one per line. Each line is separated with either a LF character or CR and LF characters. The type attribute specifies which observables will be listed.

Example description:

“BulkObservableList”:
[“kj290023j09r34.example.com”,
“09ijk23jfj0k8.example.net”,
“klknjwfjiowjefr923.example.org”,
“oimireik79msd.example.org”]

Data model in CDDL:

1. BulkObservableList: [+ text]
2. BulkObservableList: string

Which one is more suitable for us?

Moving forward

1. The generated CDDL needs to be reviewed
2. The draft itself needs to be reviewed prior to the WG last call