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## JSON is a data representation language

- JSON is the premier format for representing tree-shaped data for interchange
- Often, there is a need to identify elements or subtrees in such a tree, without transferring the whole tree
- XML has XPath, a complex, Turing-equivalent query language
- JSON has JSONPath, proposed in 2007, but never standardized


## JSONPath examples

| XPath | JSONPath | Result |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| /store/book/author | \$.store.book[*].author | the authors of all books in the store |
| //author | \$. . author | all authors |
| /store/* | \$.store.* | all things in store, which are some books and a red bicycle. |
| /store//price | \$.store..price | the price of everything in the store. |
| //book[3] | \$. . book [2] | the third book |
| //book[last()] | \$. . book[(@.length-1)] <br> \$. . book [-1:] | the last book in order. |
| //book[position()<3] | $\begin{aligned} & \$ . . \operatorname{book}[0,1] \\ & \$ . \operatorname{book}[: 2] \end{aligned}$ | the first two books |
| //book[isbn] | \$. . book[? (@.isbn)] | filter all books with isbn number |
| //book[price<10] | \$. . book[? (@.price<10)] | filter all books cheapier than 10 |
| / /* | \$ . . * | all Elements in XML document. All members of JSON structure. |

```
{ "store": {
    "book": [
        { "category": "reference",
            "author": "Nigel Rees",
            "title": "Sayings of the
Century"
            "price": 8.95
        },"category": "fiction"
            "author": "Evelyn Waugh"
            "title": "Sword of Honour",
            "price": 12.99
        },
            { "category": "fiction",
                "author": "Herman Melville",
                "title": "Moby Dick",
                "isbn": "0-553-21311-3",
                "price": 8.99
            },
            {'"category": "fiction",
                "author": "J. R. R. Tolkien",
                "title": "The Lord of the Rings",
                "isbn": "0-395-19395-8",
                price": 22.99
            ],
    ],
    "bicycle": {
        "color": "red",
        "price": 19.95
    }
}
```


## Aren't there other ways to do this?

## Sure:

- RFC 6901, JSON Pointer, very similar in idea, but different in syntax, and limited towards pointing into a single place in a known structure
- XPath extensions for JSON - all the complexity for very little functionality
- (Insert your favorite query language here)
- But the question is less "is JSONPath always the best tool for the job" it is being used a lot, and it would benefit from a common standard


## Why do we want this now?

- Well, many of us have wanted this for a while...
(Current occasion for me: JSONPath fits some loT discovery well)
- Now the stars seem to have aligned to make this possible:
- The original JSONPath author is interested in getting this done
- An amazing project has started documenting implementation deviations
- So let's do it, like we did RFC 6901 earlier.


## Why this isn't trivial

- JSONPath was defined in 2007, and implemented many times since
- JSONPath left expressions/filters to an "underlying scripting language"
- JSONPath implementations have used their implementation language or a synthetic language patterned after common usage
- These are mostly close, but not identical
- Lots of details differ
- Fortunately, there is https://cburgmer.github.io/json-path-comparison/ (225 test cases against 37 implementations, "Proposal A" in the making)
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## WG needs to decide on direction

- Find lowest common denominator and standardize that
- Won't cover that many real-world examples, no big benefit
- Find the gaps and start filling them all by dumping in more rubble
- High complexity of the result, bugs will be plenty
- Define a middle ground, filling gaps neatly where existing usage abounds
- The right thing, but probably needs some more detailed guidance
- Needs input from implementers and users
- Janus approach: look both back and forward


## Where do we want to do this?

- New Working Group (?)
- Revive JSON Working Group specifically for this
- Do this in CBOR working group because that is alive, has the same generic data model, and actually needs a tree query language as well (and probably would promise to standardize JSONPath for JSON first)
- Stuff this into a new HTTPAPI working group, because JSONPath often is used over HTTP (as is everything else)
$\rightarrow$ For the DISPATCH WG to decide!


## Please DISPATCH !

