

CBOR::Core

CBOR Cross-Platform Specification

Anders Rundgren, WebPKI.org

2025-06-21

Why not just continue with JSON forever?

Well...

- IETF standards [in practice] rather use RFC 7493 aka “I-JSON”
- The JavaScript “JSON” object in browsers is extremely limited
- JSON has no “blob” support. Base64 is all over the place
- JSON has no deterministic mode. RFC 8785 is not the same
- JSON has no extension mechanism

Properly packaged, CBOR [[RFC 8949](#)] represents a powerful alternative, unhampered by JSON legacy:

<https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-rundgren-cbor-core/>

Developers see CBOR as a set of data types + API

CBOR/CDDL	Object Wrapper	JavaScript
int	CBOR.Int	Number
bigint	CBOR.BigInt	BigInt
float	CBOR.Float	Number
bstr	CBOR.Bytes	Uint8Array
tstr	CBOR.String	String
bool	CBOR.Boolean	Boolean
null	CBOR.Null	
[]	CBOR.Array	
{ }	CBOR.Map	
#6.n	CBOR.Tag	
#7.n	CBOR.Simple	Number

Non-normative JavaScript Example

Object Wrappers are *bi-directional*, *type-checking*, and *self-rendering*.

Encode CBOR Data

```
let cbor = CBOR.Map()  
  .set(CBOR.Int(1), CBOR.Float(45.7))  
  .set(CBOR.Int(2), CBOR.String("Hi there!")).encode();  
  
console.log(CBOR.toHex(cbor));  
a201fb4046d99999999999a0269486920746865726521
```

Decode CBOR Data

```
let map = CBOR.decode(cbor); // Use result from encode  
  
console.log(map.toString()); // Diagnostic notation  
{  
  1: 45.7,  
  2: "Hi there!"  
}  
  
console.log("Value=" + map.get(CBOR.Int(1)).getFloat64());  
Value=45.7
```

Strict Type Checking API – Also in JavaScript

```
console.log("Value=" + map.get(CBOR.Int(1)).getString());  
Uncaught CborError: Expected CBOR.String, got: CBOR.Float
```

Decode Diagnostic Notation (Textual CBOR)

```
let cbor = CBOR.diagDecode(`{  
# Comments are also permitted  
  1: 45.7,  
  2: "Hi there!"  
}`).encode();  
  
console.log(CBOR.toHex(cbor));  
a201fb4046d99999999999a0269486920746865726521
```

Diagnostic Notation as input format has many uses including:

- Config files
- Test data
- Protocol development

Deterministic Encoding (DE) in CBOR::Core

- DE rationale: *simpler encoder design, practically free of cost, and potentially improved interoperability*. As a bonus, duplicate key detection becomes default.
- DE primarily relies on *sorted maps, normalized integers, and normalized floating-point numbers*.
- DE is always “on” for *encoding*.
- DE can optionally be disabled for *decoding* in order to support “legacy” CBOR.
- DE can support novel cryptographic containers, including embedded signatures. This is elaborated on in the draft.
- Application developers should hardly ever have to bother with the inner workings of deterministically encoded CBOR.

What is the alternative to an IETF specified standard?

It is a *potentially fractured* CBOR landscape, where each platform vendor does its own interpretation of what “Useful CBOR” might entail. Presumably this gets a little better than the JavaScript “JSON” object 🤔

For the IETF however, it is now or never!

Unexpected side-effect of a successful IETF standard

Since CBOR::Core targets the “bulk” of SW developers, it could eventually turn out as a de-facto definition of CBOR.

However, CBOR::Core does not in any way modify the CBOR standard; it only provides a *simplified* and *standardized* environment, particularly adapted for more traditional use cases, rather than for resource-constrained embedded systems.

Thanx!