

**CBOR @
2024-01-10**

WG documents status and issues:

Documents in processing

- In RFC editor queue (EDIT): [draft-ietf-cbor-time-tag-12](#)
- In IESG: (Nothing at this point)
- WGLC passed for [draft-ietf-cbor-update-8610-grammar-00](#) and [draft-ietf-cbor-edn-literals-06](#), **shepherding** next (WG Consensus: waiting for write-up)
- [draft-ietf-cbor-packed-10](#): Continue validation ..**2024-02-29**

CDDDL 2.0

1., 2.: see above for [draft-ietf-cbor-update-8610-grammar-02](#) and [draft-ietf-cbor-edn-literals-07](#) (related)

→  it to IESG

3. Next steps for draft-ietf-cbor-cddl-more-control-01

- -01 (2023-12-07): added `.printf`
 - probably needs a little more specification text
- anything else in this round?
- plan interim focusing on CDDL 2.0 use by other groups

4. Next steps for modules

- draft-ietf-cbor-cddl-modules-00 in use in some specifications,
e.g., workaround in draft-ietf-rats-uccs-07

```
;;; Insert the required CDDL from RFC 9052 to complete these  
;;; definitions. This can be done manually or automated by a  
;;; tool that implements an import directive such as:  
;# import rfc9052
```

- Need feedback from users now!
→ plan interim focusing on CDDL 2.0 use by other groups

draft-ietf-cbor-packed-10

- -10 has various editorial and nit fixes
- Continue validation, from specs and implementers
- Discuss implicit and incremental table setup
 - separate documents (?)

Plan from 2023-11-07 interim:

- Process some comments, e.g., Christian's <https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/msg/cbor/BBdla1kp8aUDfNeWvuDQLsBeGGE>
- Make use of more benchmarks such as dns-in-cbor
- Get more implementer feedback
- **timebox** this information acquisition period → **2024-02-29**

CDE: Next steps for draft-ietf-cbor-cde-01

- General agreement: should be advanced soon
- Need attention to detail now, -01 is step forward
 - Security considerations
 - Need to cover **all of** CBOR!
NaN payloads:
 - dusty corner in most implementations
 - CDE adds guidance
 - many won't implement even basic support
 - Problem?

dCBOR: Next steps for draft-mcnally-deterministic-cbor-07

Based on CDE, now quite simple document

- draft-mcnally-deterministic-cbor now **replaces** draft-bormann-cbor-dcbor (merged)

Disposition (way to RFC)?

- WG document (WG consensus required)
 - [] std
 - [] exp
 - [] inf
- ISE document (no WG consensus required, but help from WG appreciated)
 - [] exp
 - [] inf
 - ~~[] Discard~~

YANG-CBOR Efficiency

- YANG is XML, so fundamentally text-based
- does have binary type, encoded as byte string in YANG-CBOR
- draft-ietf-netconf-crypto-types-28 uses binary throughout

Issue: bulky textual data in RFC 6991/bis:

- date/time (RFC 3339 style)
- IP address/prefix (nnn.nnn.nnn.nnn and RFC 4291/5952)

Efficient YANG-CBOR: Stand-Ins

We have CBOR Tags: 1 (date/time), 52/54 (IP address/prefix)

- "Stand-In": Allow replacing text with tags, where appropriate
- Define equivalence on the textual level (stand-in for text string)
 - Schema-driven encoder in practice
 - [] For canonically encoded items only?
 - [] Zone-ID exceptions?
- More work needed:
 - how to announce capability? Media type parameter? Library?
 - which WG to do work: cbor, core, netmod?