

# JSONPath

January 18 (Tuesday), 10:00–12:00 UTC  
(11:00–13:00 CET, 02:00–04:00 PST)

# stataatus

37 → 12 "open" issues

The 25...

- were mostly implemented in document (~ 2021-12-02)
- just needed work to actually close github issue

# "-base"

Keep `jsonpath-base` to a baseline  
Reduces many issues to "OBE"

Proposal: Instead of keeping moot issues (e.g., #124) open, label them "`revisit-after-base-done`"

(Not mentioning all "`task`" issues here:  
some of them just need to be done.)

# #123 absent $\stackrel{?}{=}$ absent

Proposals for empty nodelists in comparison:

1: converts to »**undefined**« (i.e., yes!)

2: converts to »**NaN**«-like isolate (i.e., no!)

(Underlying assumption: The domain/range of expression language constructs is not limited to JSON values)

112: → discuss use cases on the list

# #123 equivalence/duality

```
; 1 (undefined-style)
@a == @.b ; yes
@a && @.a == @.b ; no

; 2 (NaN-style)
!@.a && !@.b || @.a == @.b ; yes
@a == @.b ; no
```

# #70

Regular expressions in filters #70

Already decided: RE literals only, no compute.

- Select (define) one regular expression flavor
- Provide a way to plug in regular expressions
- Not in base RFC (but keep an extension point)

# #70: select one regular expression flavor

No consensus of existing implementations.

So we get to choose.

Principle of least surprise vs. interoperability

Parsing/searching REs vs. matching REs

- Select a version of ECMAScript (parsing/searching RE)
- Select W3C XSD RE (matching RE)
- Build modest subset (e.g., iregexp)



Examples Appendix #69

Yeah, should make one, when we have time...



# #67

Differentiation from JSON Pointer #67

Write a passage contrasting JSONPath to JSON Pointer.  
Placeholder already in Intro.

Need to write text, with suggestions from Mark Nottingham and Carsten Bormann  
(See also #44)

# #55

W3C WoT discovery, geolocation, and JSON pointers #55

Actual user requirements, for once.

(With some confusion about where JSON pointers go in a URI, clarified).

Proposal: get updated info; make sure we meet these requirements.

# #25

Security items #25

Discussion item.

Task: Write the actual Security Considerations section.

# #23

## Duplicates in selector output #23

Discussion confused by the lack of distinction between duplicate **values** and duplicate **nodes**.

Pretty clear that we don't remove duplicate **values**.

PR #134 makes it less attractive to remove duplicate **nodes**.

Proposal: Don't.

Confirm today.

# #21

"Union" could have more description, and maybe a new name #21

Discussion item without much discussion.

Proposal: close. [after fixing the slice-index ABNF.]

Confirm today.

# #2

An automatic commit check for the ABNF would have been nice-to-have, but we can do this manually (`scripts/gen.sh`).

Proposal: wontfix

# next:

Get this written up

WGLC