CBOR working group conference call, 6 October 2021

Meetecho: https://meetings.conf.meetecho.com/interim/?short=4a1c938d-d177-47e4-993a-642f780be861 (https://meetings.conf.meetecho.com/interim/?short=4a1c938d-d177-47e4-993a-642f780be861)

Previous meeting's minutes: https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/minutes-interim-2021-cbor-17-202109221600/ (https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/minutes-interim-2021-cbor-17-202109221600/)
...or directly: https://datatracker.ietf.org/meeting/interim-2021-cbor-17/materials/minutes-interim-2021-cbor-17-202109221600-01.html (https://datatracker.ietf.org/meeting/interim-2021-cbor-17/materials/minutes-interim-2021-cbor-17/materials/minutes-interim-2021-cbor-17-202109221600-01.html)

Preliminary agenda (please edit):

- WG documents status and issues
  - cbor-network-address: discuss IESG feedback, including Éric's DISCUSS
  - draft-bormann-cbor-edn-literals: newly posted this morning
- CBOR use in other SDOs
- AOB

Notes (please volunteer to help take notes): Marco Tiloca

cbor-network-address

MCR: Got IESG comments to address, Github issues on those.

MCR: (page5) Uppercase or lowercase HEX in examples? I'm agnostic on it.
ST (chat): Don't shout keep it lower.
BL: Also preference for lower case, but it matters the most to be consistent.

MCR: (page 6) Support Link-Local scope addresses with IPv6; overviewed possible alternatives. Comments/objections?
CB: Need to be careful. It applies to addresses but not prefixes. Cases 1 and 3 have to be addressed. What in slide 2 is an alternative way to YANG to provide this information. It's a good solution if we agree we have a problem.
CB: What about multicast addresses?
MCR: They need a scope id.

MCR: (page 7) What to do with invalid lengths? Leave it to the application and what it thinks best.
CB: Add a paragraph about tag validity and what should be checked.
MCR: Then it's up the library and not the application?
CB: CBOR leaves it open, but it's good to clarify.
MCR: So also clarify when exactly an address is invalid and to be handled.

MCR: (page 8) What to do with ehternet addresses? Fine for this document. Just remain mute?
CB: RFC7042 might help, but it's informational and not ideal.

MCR: I can cover all points today.

FP: You replied to most emails, but Roman hasn't got a reply yet.

MCR: I'll check and reply.

IMD: About lengths, there was a mail from Donald Eastlake.
https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/msg/cbor/rz2lrhu956pVuzCqkTzfhhhEelU/ (https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/msg/cbor/rz2lrhu956pVuzCqkTzfhhhEelU/)

MCR: Is anyone using this for configurations longer than a second? I'll reply but I don't think we shold change things on this.

AOB

- draft-bormann-cbor-edn-literals

CB: I wrote a new draft. Don't know where this content should actually go. Enabling application-oriented extensions through registered identifiers, e.g. h, b32, h32, …

CB: "cri" as relevant example, useful for diagnostic notation for CRIs (see https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-ietf-core-href/ (https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-ietf-core-href/)). Note that multiple CRI can be converted to the same URI.

CB: Still need to polish it, but good to have feedback also on the overall direction.

CB: There is no ABNF (unusual for me), but it's still fine and might be provided if needed.

IMD: Yes, let's do it. If it's for descriptive purposes, fine even if ABNF is not present. I believe we need this extensions.

MCR (chat): Yes, thanks

MT (chat): Yes, it's good for HREF like discussed in the past.

FP: Do you need an interim on November 3rd? There is IETF plenary session.

BL: I don't think we will, the IETF week follows. I'll double check on the list.

[CB]: Carsten Bormann
[BL]: Barry Leiba
[FP]: Francesca Palombini
[IMD]: Ira McDonald
[MCR]: Michael Richardson
[CA]: Christian Amsüss
[MT]: Marco Tiloca
[PP]: Philip Prindeville
[ST]: Sean Turner