cbor

2019-10-23 virtual interim

CBOR WG Meeting — Interim
Wednesday, October 23, 2019, 15:00–16:00 UTC
Chairs: Francesca Palombini, Jim Schaad

Webex: https://ietf.webex.com/ietf/j.php?
MTID=m1237a98124111de3a4c4e61dfaca05d5
Etherpad: https://etherpad.tools.ietf.org/p/notes-
interim-1023-cbor

— CBORbis –08, remaining issues

CBORbis status

Still at –07 (waiting for more merges)

Recently merged:

— 112 ➔ 114 ➔ 119: non-well-formed examples
— 115: build deterministic on preferred
— 116: remove "strict mode"
— 117: defaults for JSON to CBOR conversion
— 118: (tag validity, 24 and 36)

5 PRs open now.
4 Mostly trivial:

— 124: reference RFC 8618 analysis

— 125: markdown cleanup tag 4/5 (close 120)

— 128: advice on small keys (close 68)

— 129: define "encoded data item" (close 64)

1 Non-trivial:

— 127 Grand overhaul of tag language
   and related text about validity

   — terms: some more cleanup (missed in 109),
      "tag content",
      "basic validity" vs. "tag validity"

   Mostly get rid of "optional tagging" as a concept
   Explicitly talk about inadmissible content values
   Discuss semantic equivalence of tags as map keys

Could add some discussion of semantic validity (86)

Work remaining: Clear way forward

Mostly Editorial Issues:

— 122: combine 5.3, 5.8
  ➔ move most of 5.8 to 5.3, reduce redundancy
  ➔ do not discuss deterministic encoding here
  Possibly move rest of 5.8 to security considerations?
  "CBOR firewalls"???

Work remaining: Discuss

— 121: binary MIME
We have Tag 257 for binary MIME already
Can tag 36 stay as is?
Should we mention tag 257?

— 67: More about handling unknown tags/simples?

— 63: More rules about handling identical map keys?

Technical Issues

— 94: Signaling NaNs
sNaN: Stepchild, not used much in IEEE 754

  — Avoid setting up traps for ourselves

  — Enable use of all of IEEE 754 if desired (sNaNs, payloads)

  ➔ Default to one qNaN only

— 92: Tags that care about their relative order
➔ Explain that these are special use