

Internet Engineering Task Force
Internet-Draft
Intended status: Informational
Expires: 17 April 2026

A. Rundgren, Ed.
Independent
14 October 2025

CBOR::Core - CBOR Cross Platform Profile
draft-rundgren-cbor-core-15

Abstract

This document defines CBOR::Core, a platform profile for CBOR (RFC 8949) intended to serve as a viable replacement for JSON in computationally advanced systems like Internet browsers, mobile phones, and Web servers. To foster interoperability, deterministic encoding is mandated. Furthermore, the document outlines how deterministic encoding combined with enhanced CBOR tools, enable cryptographic methods like signing and hashing, to optionally use "raw" (non-wrapped) CBOR data as input. This document mainly targets CBOR tool developers.

Status of This Memo

This Internet-Draft is submitted in full conformance with the provisions of BCP 78 and BCP 79.

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts. The list of current Internet-Drafts is at <https://datatracker.ietf.org/drafts/current/>.

Internet-Drafts are draft documents valid for a maximum of six months and may be updated, replaced, or obsoleted by other documents at any time. It is inappropriate to use Internet-Drafts as reference material or to cite them other than as "work in progress."

This Internet-Draft will expire on 17 April 2026.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2025 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

This document is subject to BCP 78 and the IETF Trust's Legal Provisions Relating to IETF Documents (<https://trustee.ietf.org/license-info>) in effect on the date of publication of this document. Please review these documents carefully, as they describe your rights and restrictions with respect to this document. Code Components

extracted from this document must include Revised BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the Trust Legal Provisions and are provided without warranty as described in the Revised BSD License.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	3
1.1. Design Goals	3
1.2. Requirements Language	3
1.3. Common Definitions	3
2. Detailed Description	4
2.1. Supported CBOR Objects	4
2.2. Deterministic Encoding Scheme	5
2.3. Implementation Considerations	6
2.3.1. API Requirements	6
2.3.1.1. Application/Encoding Level Considerations	7
2.3.2. Protocol Primitives	7
2.3.2.1. Non-Finite Numbers	10
2.3.3. Media Type	10
2.3.4. Diagnostic Notation	11
2.3.5. CBOR Sequences	14
3. IANA Considerations	14
4. Security Considerations	14
5. References	14
5.1. Normative References	14
5.2. Informative References	15
Appendix A. Deterministic Encoding Samples	17
A.1. Integers	17
A.2. Floating-Point Numbers	19
A.3. Miscellaneous Items	22
A.4. Invalid Encodings	23
Appendix B. Embedded Signatures	25
B.1. Sample Signature	25
B.1.1. Unsigned Data	25
B.1.2. Signature Process	26
B.1.3. Validation Process	27
B.1.4. Example Parameters	28
B.2. Code Example	28
Appendix C. Backward Compatibility	29
Appendix D. Compatible Online Tools	30
Appendix E. Compatible Implementations	30
Document History	31
Acknowledgements	33
Author's Address	34

1. Introduction

The CBOR::Core specification is based on CBOR [RFC8949]. While there are different ways you can encode certain CBOR objects, this is non-trivial to support in general purpose platform-based tools, not to mention the limited utility of such measures. To cope with this, CBOR::Core defines a specific (non-variant) encoding scheme, aka "Deterministic Encoding". The selected encoding scheme is believed to be compatible with most existing systems using CBOR. See also Appendix C.

CBOR::Core is intended to be agnostic with respect to programming languages and platforms.

By combining the compact binary representation and the rich set of data types offered by CBOR, with a deterministic encoding scheme, CBOR::Core could for new designs, serve as a viable alternative to JSON [RFC8259]. Although the mandated encoding scheme is deployable in [CONSTRAINED] environments, the primary target is rather general-purpose computing platforms like mobile phones and Web servers.

However, for unleashing the full power of deterministic encoding, the ability to perform cryptographic operations on "raw" (non-wrapped) CBOR data, compliant CBOR::Core tools need additional functionality. See also Appendix B.

1.1. Design Goals

The primary goal with this specification, is providing a foundation for CBOR tools that enable application developers to use CBOR without requiring insights in low-level details like encoding. In most cases, it should be sufficient to consult a list of supported data types. See also Section 2.3.2.

Section 2 contains the actual specification.

1.2. Requirements Language

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "NOT RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in BCP 14 [RFC2119] [RFC8174] when, and only when, they appear in all capitals, as shown here.

1.3. Common Definitions

- * This document uses the conventions defined in CDDL [RFC8610] for expressing the type of CBOR [RFC8949] data items.

- * Examples showing CBOR data, are expressed in "diagnostic notation" (Section 2.3.4).
- * The term "CBOR object" is equivalent to "CBOR data item" used in [RFC8949].

2. Detailed Description

This section describes the three pillars that CBOR::Core relies on.

2.1. Supported CBOR Objects

The following table shows the set of CBOR objects that compliant CBOR::Core implementations MUST support:

CBOR	Comment
int	Integer
bigint	Big integer
float	16-, 32-, and 64-bit [IEEE754] floating-point numbers
tstr	Text string encoded as UTF-8 [RFC3629]
bstr	Byte string
bool	Boolean true and false
null	Represents a null object
[]	Array
{}	Map
#6.nnn(type)	Tagged objects
#7.nnn	Simple values

Table 1: Supported CBOR Objects

Although extensions are imaginable, extensions will most likely cause interoperability issues and are thus NOT RECOMMENDED.

However, nothing prevents developers from at the application (API) level, through CBOR tags and similar mapping concepts, support additional, "virtual" data types, analogous to how you map an application's data model to the set of data types available, be it a data interchange format, a database, or a programming language.

OpenAPI [OPENAPI] is an example of an API that defines data types through mapping.

Application-specific implementations may (of course) only have to support the CBOR::Core objects required by the targeted application(s).

2.2. Deterministic Encoding Scheme

In CBOR::Core deterministic encoding is _mandatory_. The encoding scheme adheres to Section 4.2 of [RFC8949], but adds a few constraints (denoted by RFC+), where the RFC offers choices. The following list contains a summary of the CBOR::Core deterministic encoding rules:

- * RFC+: Floating-point and integer objects **MUST** be treated as _distinct types_ regardless of their numeric value. This is compliant with "Rule 2" in Section 4.2.2 of [RFC8949].
- * RFC: Integers, represented by the `int` and `bigint` types, **MUST** use the `int` type if the value is between -2^{64} and $2^{64}-1$, otherwise the `bigint` type **MUST** be used. Appendix A.1 features a list of integer sample values and their expected encoding.
- * RFC+: The optimized representation of integers (aka "Preferred Serialization"), **MUST** also be applied to string lengths, array/map counts, and tag numbers.
- * RFC+: Floating-point numbers **MUST** always use the shortest [IEEE754] variant that preserves the precision of the original value, including subnormal values. Appendix A.2 features a list of floating-point sample values and their expected encoding. Also see Section 2.3.2.1.
- * RFC: Map keys **MUST** be sorted in the bitwise lexicographic order of their deterministic encoding. Duplicate keys **MUST** be _rejected_.

- * RFC+: Since CBOR encodings according to this specification maintain uniqueness, there are no specific restrictions or tests needed in order to determine map key equivalence. As an (extreme) example, the floating-point numbers 0.0 and -0.0, and the integer number 0 could represent the distinct keys f90000, f98000, and 00 respectively.
- * RFC: Indefinite length objects MUST be `_rejected_`.

2.3. Implementation Considerations

In CBOR::Core there are three distinguishable levels:

Encoding level:

"Wire format" as described in Section 2.2.

Encoder/decoder level:

This section.

Application level:

Constraints on data imposed by `_applications_`, like limiting ISO DateTime objects to UTC notation, or requiring integers representing enumerations to be in a specific range, is `_out-of-scope_` for CBOR::Core.

2.3.1. API Requirements

An important feature that deterministic encoding brings to the table is that wrapping CBOR data to be signed in `bstr` objects, like specified by COSE in Section 2 of [RFC9052], no longer is a prerequisite. That is, cryptographic operations can `_optionally_` be performed on "raw" CBOR data. Turn to Appendix B for an example of an application depending on such features.

However, to make this a reality, the following functionality MUST be provided by CBOR tools compliant with this specification:

- * Decoded CBOR primitives MUST remain `_immutable_`, regardless if they are stand-alone or being a part of a tagged object like `bigfloat` (see Section 3.4.4 of [RFC8949]).
- * To support `_variant_` CBOR data, it MUST be possible to find out the type of a CBOR object, `_before_` it is referenced.
- * It MUST be possible to `_add_`, `_delete_`, and `_update_` the contents of CBOR map and array objects, of decoded CBOR data.

- * It MUST be possible to `_reserialize_` decoded CBOR data, be it updated or not.
- * Irrespective of if CBOR data is decoded, updated, or created programmatically, deterministic encoding MUST be maintained.
- * Invalid or unsupported CBOR constructs, as well as CBOR data not adhering to the deterministic encoding scheme MUST be `_rejected_`. See also Appendix C and Appendix A.4.

Appendix B.2 shows an example that `_updates_` and `_reserializes_` decoded CBOR data.

2.3.1.1. Application/Encoding Level Considerations

As a consequence of these rules, CBOR data and application / platform-level data, MUST be `_separated_` for cases where `_reserialization_` could present a problem.

How this separation is accomplished is out of scope for this specification. However, `_encapsulation_` of CBOR data in `_high-level_`, and `_self-rendering wrapper objects_`, represents an established method, featured in similar tools for ASN.1.

Applied to the JavaScript Date object, and using [CBOR.JS], the following example highlights the issues:

```
// Sample CBOR tstr object: "2025-03-02T13:08:55.0201+03:00"
let cbor = CBOR.fromHex("781e323032352d303332d30325431333a30383a35352e303230312b303333a3030030");
let cborObject = CBOR.decode(cbor)

// JavaScript Date only supports milliseconds and converts time to UTC
console.log(cborObject.getDateTime().toISOString());
> 2025-03-02T10:08:55.020Z

console.log(CBOR.toHex(cborObject.encode())); // Reencode returns identical CBOR data
> 781e323032352d303332d30325431333a30383a35352e303230312b303333a30300
```

As can be seen in the listing, `_application_ level`, data may not always be 100% deterministic, while at the `_encoding_ level`, data remain intact.

2.3.2. Protocol Primitives

To facilitate cross-platform `_protocol interoperability_`, implementers of CBOR::Core compatible tools SHOULD include `_decoder_` API support for the following primitive data types:

CBOR	Primitive	Comment	Notes
int	Int8	8-bit signed integer	1
uint	UInt8	8-bit unsigned integer	1
int	Int16	16-bit signed integer	1
uint	UInt16	16-bit unsigned integer	1
int	Int32	32-bit signed integer	1
uint	UInt32	32-bit unsigned integer	1
int	Int64	64-bit signed integer	1
uint	UInt64	64-bit unsigned integer	1
integer	BigInt	Integer of arbitrary size	2
float16	Float16	16-bit floating-point number	3, 4
float16 / float32	Float32	32-bit floating-point number	3, 4
float	Float64	64-bit floating-point number	4
bool	Boolean	Boolean	
null	Null	Null	5
#7.nnn	Simple	Simple values	6
tstr	String	Text string	
bstr	Bytes	Byte string	
See note	DateTime	Time object expressed as a text string	7
See note	EpochTime	Time object expressed as a number	7, 8

Table 2: Protocol Primitives

1. Range testing **MUST** be performed using the traditional ranges for `_unsigned_` respectively `_two-complement_` numbers. That is, a hypothetical `getUint8()` **MUST** reject numbers outside of 0 to 255, whereas a hypothetical `getInt8()`, **MUST** reject numbers outside of -128 to 127.
2. Note that a hypothetical `getBigInt()` **MUST** also accept CBOR int objects since int is used for integers that fit in CBOR major type 0 and 1 objects. See also Appendix A.1 and Appendix C.
3. Some platforms do not natively support float32 and/or float16. In this case a hypothetical `getFloat16()` would need to use a bigger floating-point type for the return value.

Note that a hypothetical `getFloat16()` **MUST** reject encountered Float32 and Float64 objects. See also Appendix C.

4. See Section 2.3.2.1.
5. Since a CBOR null typically represents the absence of a value, a decoder **MUST** provide a test-function, like `isNull()`.
6. Simple values include the ranges 0-23 and 32-255. Note that bool and null actually are simple values.
7. Since CBOR lacks a native-level time object, Section 3.4 of [RFC8949] introduces two variants of time objects using the CBOR tags 0 and 1. The time objects **SHOULD** also be supported `_without_` the tag construct.
8. EpochTime objects containing non-finite numbers **MUST** be rejected. See also Section 2.3.2.1.

If a call does not match the underlying CBOR type, the call **MUST** be rejected,

Due to considerable variations between platforms, corresponding `_encoder_` API support does not appear to be meaningful to specify in detail: Java doesn't have built-in support for unsigned integers, whereas JavaScript requires the use of the JavaScript `BigInt` type for dealing with 64-bit integers.

2.3.2.1. Non-Finite Numbers

Since non-finite numbers like NaN, are rarely used in application protocols, one could imagine a global option making decoders reject non-finite numbers, which in turn would relieve applications from having to explicitly test decoded float objects for being finite ("regular") floating-point numbers. Although working, such an option would not be particularly flexible.

To cope with this as well as the fact that platform-native support for NaN with payloads like fa7f801000 is somewhat uneven, compliant CBOR::Core implementations **MUST** adhere to the scheme below.

Enable application protocols to selectively accept non-finite numbers, including distinguishing between "simple" NaN (f97e00) and NaN with payloads. This is accomplished by (internally) treating non-finite numbers as a distinct, emulated data type, making it possible to support the full range of floating-point numbers. The API exposes this capability as three distinct levels of floating-point number support:

BASIC:

Supporting "regular" floating-point numbers only.

EXTENDED:

Supporting "regular" floating-point numbers, "simple" NaN and Infinity.

COMPLETE:

Supporting all valid floating-point numbers.

Selection of the level of floating-point number support required for a specific float object in a protocol, is accomplished through the use of different API access methods, like the following:

A hypothetical `getFloat64()` would reject an encountered NaN, while a hypothetical `getExtendedFloat64()` would return the decoded NaN.

Also see [NON-FINITE] for a concrete solution, that also addresses encoding of non-finite numbers.

2.3.3. Media Type

Protocols building on CBOR::Core, are **RECOMMENDED** using the media type: `application/cbor`.

2.3.4. Diagnostic Notation

Compliant CBOR::Core implementations SHOULD include support for `_bi-directional_` diagnostic notation, to facilitate:

- * Generation of developer-friendly debugging and logging data
- * Easy creation of test and configuration data

Note that decoders for diagnostic notation, MUST always produce deterministically encoded CBOR data, compliant with this specification. This includes `_automatic_` sorting of map keys as well.

The supported notation is compliant with a subset of Section 8 of [RFC8949] (b32' and encoding indicators were left out), but adds a few items to make diagnostic notation slightly more adapted for parsing, like single-line comments:

CBOR	Syntax	Comment	Notes
	<code>/ _comment text_ /</code>	Multi-line comment. Multi-line comments are treated as whitespace and may thus also be used <code>_between_</code> CBOR objects.	6
	<code># _comment text_</code>	Single-line comment. Single-line comments are terminated by a newline character (<code>'\n'</code>) or EOF. Single-line comments may also terminate lines holding regular CBOR items.	6
integer	<code>_{sign}{_0b 0o 0x_}n_</code>	Arbitrary sized integers without fractional components or exponents. See also CBOR integer encoding. For <code>_input_</code> data in diagnostic notation, binary, octal, and hexadecimal notation is also supported by prepending numbers with	1, 2

		0b, 0o, and 0x respectively. The latter also permit arbitrary insertions of '_' characters between digits to enable grouping of data like 0b100_000000001.	
float	_{sign}n_.n{_e±_n}_	Floating-point values MUST include a decimal point and at least one fractional digit, whereas exponents are _optional_.	1, 2
float	float'_hex-data_'	Any valid 16, 32, or 64-bit float value, including NaN with payloads like float'7ff0800000000001'.	
float	NaN	Not a number (NaN) in the default CBOR encoding (f97e00).	
float	_{sign}_Infinity	Infinity.	2
bstr	h'_hex-data_'	Byte data provided in hexadecimal notation. Each byte MUST be represented by two hexadecimal digits.	3
bstr	b64'_base64-data_'	Byte data provided in base64 or base64URL notation. Padding with '=' characters is _optional_.	3, 6
bstr	'_text_'	Byte data provided as UTF-8 encoded text.	4, 5, 6
bstr	<< _object..._ >>	Construct holding zero or more comma-separated CBOR objects that are subsequently wrapped in a byte string.	6

tstr	"_text_"	UTF-8 encoded text string.	4, 5
bool	true false	Boolean value.	
null	null	Null value.	
[]	[_object..._]	Array with zero or more comma-separated CBOR objects.	
{ }	{ _key_:_value..._ }	Map with zero or more comma-separated key/value pairs. Key and value pairs are expressed as CBOR objects, separated by a ':' character.	
#6.nnn	_n_(_object_)	Tag holding a CBOR object.	1
#7.nnn	simple(_n_)	Simple value.	1
	,	Separator character for CBOR sequences.	6

Table 3: Diagnostic Notation

1. The letter `_n_` in the Syntax column denotes one or more digits.
2. The optional `_ {sign}_` MUST be a single hyphen ('-') character.
3. `_Input only_`: between tokens, the whitespace characters ' ', '\t', '\r', and '\n', are `_ignored_`.
4. `_Input only_`: inside of string quotes, the control character '\n' becomes a part of the text string. For normalizing line terminators, a single '\r' or the combination '\r\n' MUST (internally) be rewritten as '\n'. To `_avoid_` getting newline characters ('\n') included in multi-line text strings, a `_line continuation marker_` consisting of a backslash ('\') immediately preceding the newline may be used.

5. Text strings may also include the JavaScript compatible escape sequences `'\''`, `'\"'`, `'\\'`, `'\b'`, `'\f'`, `'\n'`, `'\r'`, `'\t'`, and `'\u_hhhh_'`.

6. `_Input only_`.

The [PLAYGROUND] is an excellent way of getting acquainted with CBOR and diagnostic notation.

2.3.5. CBOR Sequences

Decoders compliant with this specification MUST support CBOR sequences [RFC8742].

For decoders of "true" (binary) CBOR, there are additional requirements:

- * It MUST be possible to decode one CBOR object at a time.
- * The decoder MUST NOT do any assumptions about the nature of unread code (it might not even be CBOR).

3. IANA Considerations

This memo includes no request to IANA.

4. Security Considerations

CBOR::Core does not introduce security issues beyond what is already applicable to [RFC8949].

Poorly written tools and applications may certainly introduce security issues, but this is out of scope for this specification.

5. References

5.1. Normative References

- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", BCP 14, RFC 2119, DOI 10.17487/RFC2119, March 1997, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2119>>.
- [RFC8174] Leiba, B., "Ambiguity of Uppercase vs Lowercase in RFC 2119 Key Words", BCP 14, RFC 8174, DOI 10.17487/RFC8174, May 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8174>>.

- [RFC8949] Bormann, C. and P. Hoffman, "Concise Binary Object Representation (CBOR)", STD 94, RFC 8949, DOI 10.17487/RFC8949, December 2020, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8949>>.
- [RFC8610] Birkholz, H., Vigano, C., and C. Bormann, "Concise Data Definition Language (CDDL): A Notational Convention to Express Concise Binary Object Representation (CBOR) and JSON Data Structures", RFC 8610, DOI 10.17487/RFC8610, June 2019, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8610>>.
- [RFC3629] Yergeau, F., "UTF-8, a transformation format of ISO 10646", STD 63, RFC 3629, DOI 10.17487/RFC3629, November 2003, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3629>>.
- [RFC8742] Bormann, C., "Concise Binary Object Representation (CBOR) Sequences", RFC 8742, DOI 10.17487/RFC8742, February 2020, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8742>>.
- [IEEE754] IEEE, "IEEE Standard for Floating-Point Arithmetic", IEEE Std 754-2019, DOI 10.1109/IEEESTD.2019.8766229, <<https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/8766229>>.

5.2. Informative References

- [RFC9052] Schaad, J., "CBOR Object Signing and Encryption (COSE): Structures and Process", STD 96, RFC 9052, DOI 10.17487/RFC9052, August 2022, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc9052>>.
- [RFC9053] Schaad, J., "CBOR Object Signing and Encryption (COSE): Initial Algorithms", RFC 9053, DOI 10.17487/RFC9053, August 2022, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc9053>>.
- [RFC8785] Rundgren, A., Jordan, B., and S. Erdtman, "JSON Canonicalization Scheme (JCS)", RFC 8785, DOI 10.17487/RFC8785, June 2020, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8785>>.
- [RFC8259] Bray, T., Ed., "The JavaScript Object Notation (JSON) Data Interchange Format", STD 90, RFC 8259, DOI 10.17487/RFC8259, December 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8259>>.
- [CSF] "CBOR Signature Format (CSF)", <<https://cyberphone.github.io/javaapi/org/webpki/cbor/doc-files/signatures.html>>.

- [COTX] Rundgren, A., "CBOR Object Type Extension (COTX)",
 <<https://www.ietf.org/archive/id/draft-rundgren-cotx-04.html>>.
- [CONSTRAINED]
 "D-CBOR for Constrained Devices",
 <<https://github.com/cyberphone/D-CBOR/blob/main/d-cbor-4-constrained-devices.md>>.
- [NODE.JS] "Node.js - JavaScript server", <<https://nodejs.org/>>.
- [NON-FINITE]
 "Non-Finite Numbers",
 <<https://cyberphone.github.io/CBOR.js/doc/non-finite-numbers.html>>.
- [CBOR.JS] "CBOR.js - CBOR for JavaScript",
 <<https://github.com/cyberphone/CBOR.js>>.
- [CSF-LAB] "Online CBOR and CSF test tool",
 <<https://test.webpki.org/csf-lab>>.
- [PLAYGROUND]
 "Online CBOR testing tool",
 <<https://cyberphone.github.io/CBOR.js/doc/playground.html>>.
- [OPENKEYSTORE]
 "Java library supporting JSON, CBOR, and Crypto",
 <<https://github.com/cyberphone/openkeystore>>.
- [ANDROID-CBOR]
 "Android/Java library supporting CBOR and Crypto",
 <<https://github.com/cyberphone/android-cbor>>.
- [OPENAPI] "The OpenAPI Initiative", <<https://openapis.org/>>.
- [CREDENTIALS]
 Sporny (et al), M., "Verifiable Credential Data Integrity
 1.0", 2025, <<https://www.w3.org/TR/vc-data-integrity/>>.
- [CBOR.ME] Bormann, C., "Online CBOR testing tool",
 <<https://cbor.me/>>.

[ECMAScript]

Ecma International, "ECMAScript 2024 Language Specification", Standard ECMA-262, 15th Edition, June 2024, <<https://www.ecma-international.org/publications/standards/Ecma-262.htm>>.

[WALLET]

Rundgren, A., "Defensive publication: Partial Encryption, Full Signature", <<https://cyberphone.github.io/doc/defensive-publications/partial-encryption-full-signature.pdf>>.

Appendix A. Deterministic Encoding Samples

A.1. Integers

This `_normative_` section holds a selection of CBOR integer values, with an emphasize on edge cases.

Diagnostic Notation	CBOR Encoding	Comment
0	00	Smallest positive implicit int
-1	20	Smallest negative implicit int
23	17	Largest positive implicit int
-24	37	Largest negative implicit int
24	1818	Smallest positive one-byte int
-25	3818	Smallest negative one-byte int
255	18ff	Largest positive one-byte int

-256	38ff	Largest negative one-byte int
256	190100	Smallest positive two-byte int
-257	390100	Smallest negative two-byte int
65535	19ffff	Largest positive two-byte int
-65536	39ffff	Largest negative two-byte int
65536	1a00010000	Smallest positive four-byte int
-65537	3a00010000	Smallest negative four-byte int
4294967295	1affffffff	Largest positive four-byte int
-4294967296	3affffffff	Largest negative four-byte int
4294967296	1b00000000100000000	Smallest positive eight-byte int
-4294967297	3b00000000100000000	Smallest negative eight-byte int
18446744073709551615	1bffffffffffffffff	Largest positive eight-byte int

-18446744073709551616	3bffffffffffffffff	Largest negative eight-byte int
18446744073709551616	c249010000000000000000	Smallest positive bigint
-18446744073709551617	c349010000000000000000	Smallest negative bigint

Table 4: Integers

A.2. Floating-Point Numbers

This `_normative_` section holds a selection of [IEEE754] 16, 32, and 64-bit values, with an emphasize on edge cases.

The textual representation of the values is based on the serialization method for the Number data type, defined by [ECMAScript] with one change: to comply with diagnostic notation (Section 2.3.4), all values are expressed as floating-point numbers. The rationale for using [ECMAScript] serialization is because it is supposed to generate the shortest and most correct representation of [IEEE754] numbers.

Diagnostic Notation	CBOR Encoding	Comment
0.0	f90000	Zero
-0.0	f98000	Negative zero
Infinity	f97c00	Infinity
-Infinity	f9fc00	Negative infinity
NaN	f97e00	Not a number
5.960464477539063e-8	f90001	Smallest positive subnormal float16

0.00006097555160522461	f903ff	Largest positive subnormal float16
0.00006103515625	f90400	Smallest positive float16
65504.0	f97bff	Largest positive float16
1.401298464324817e-45	fa00000001	Smallest positive subnormal float32
1.1754942106924411e-38	fa007fffff	Largest positive subnormal float32
1.1754943508222875e-38	fa00800000	Smallest positive float32
3.4028234663852886e+38	fa7f7fffff	Largest positive float32
5.0e-324	fb0000000000000001	Smallest positive subnormal float64
2.225073858507201e-308	fb000fffffffffffffff	Largest positive subnormal float64
2.2250738585072014e-308	fb0010000000000000	Smallest positive float64
1.7976931348623157e+308	fb7fefffffffffffffff	Largest positive

		float64
-0.0000033333333333333333333333333333	fbbecbf647612f3696	Randomly selected number
10.559998512268066	fa4128f5c1	- "-
10.559998512268068	fb40251eb820000001	Next in succession
295147905179352830000.0	fa61800000	2^68 (diagnostic notation truncates precision)
2.0	f94000	Number without a fractional part
-5.960464477539063e-8	f98001	Smallest negative subnormal float16
-5.960464477539062e-8	fbbe6fffffffffffffff	Adjacent smallest negative subnormal float16
-5.960464477539064e-8	fbbe70000000000001	- "-
-5.960465188081798e-8	fab3800001	- "-
0.0000609755516052246	fb3f0ff7ffffffffffff	Adjacent largest subnormal float16
0.000060975551605224616	fb3f0ff80000000001	- "-
0.00006097555243203416	fa387fc001	- "-
0.00006103515624999999	fb3f0fffffffffffffff	Adjacent smallest

		float16
0.00006103515625000001	fb3f10000000000001	- "-
0.00006103516352595761	fa38800001	- "-
65503.999999999999	fb40effbffffffffffff	Adjacent largest float16
65504.000000000001	fb40effc0000000001	- "-
65504.00390625	fa477fe001	- "-
1.4012984643248169e-45	fb369fffffffffffffff	Adjacent smallest subnormal float32
1.4012984643248174e-45	fb36a0000000000001	- "-
1.175494210692441e-38	fb380ffffffbfffffff	Adjacent largest subnormal float32
1.1754942106924412e-38	fb380ffffffc0000001	- "-
1.1754943508222874e-38	fb380fffffffffffffff	Adjacent smallest float32
1.1754943508222878e-38	fb3810000000000001	- "-
3.4028234663852882e+38	fb47efffffdfffffff	Adjacent largest float32
3.402823466385289e+38	fb47efffffe0000001	- "-

Table 5: Floating-Point Numbers

A.3. Miscellaneous Items

This normative section holds a selection of miscellaneous CBOR objects and their encoding.

Diagnostic Notation	CBOR Encoding	Comment
true	f5	Boolean true
null	f6	Null
simple(99)	f863	Simple value
0("2025-03-30T12:24:16Z")	c074323032352d30332d33305431323a32343a31365a	ISO date/time
[1, [2, 3], [4, 5]]	8301820203820405	Array combinations
{ "a": 0, "b": 1, "aa": 2 }	a361610161620262616103	Map object
h'48656c6c6f2043424f5221'	4b48656c6c6f2043424f5221	Binary string
" science"	6cf09f9a8020736369656e6365	Text string with emoji
float'7f800001'	fa7f800001	NaN with payload

Table 6: Miscellaneous Items

A.4. Invalid Encodings

The following table holds a selection of CBOR-encoded objects that not permitted by CBOR::Core in `_deterministic_` mode.

CBOR Encoding	Diagnostic Notation	Comment	Notes
a2616201616100	{ "b": 1, "a": 0 }	Improper map key ordering	1
98020405	[4, 5]	Improper array length indicator	1

1900ff	255	Number with leading zero bytes	1
c34a000100000000000000000000	-18446744073709551617	Number with leading zero bytes	1
Fa41280000	10.5	not using shortest encoding	1
fa7fc00000	NaN	not using shortest encoding	1
fa7fffe000	float'7fff'	not using shortest encoding	1
c243010000	65536	Incorrect value for bigint	1
5f4101420203ff	(_ h'01', h'0203')	Indefinite length object	2
fc		Reserved	
f818		Invalid simple value	
5b001000000000000000000000		Extremely large bstr length indicator: 4503599627370496	

Table 7: Invalid Encodings

1. Supported by the measures mentioned in Appendix C.
2. Unsupported since it is in conflict with `_deterministically_` encoded CBOR.

Appendix B. Embedded Signatures

This is a `_non-normative_` appendix showing how CBOR::Core can be used for supporting embedded signatures.

The primary advantages with `_embedded_` signatures compared to `_enveloping_` signatures (like used by COSE [RFC9052]), include:

- * Keeping the `_structure_` of the original (unsigned) data intact, by simply making signatures an additional attribute.
- * Enabling top-level, `_object identifiers_` to become a part of the signed data as well:

```
123456789({                                # CBOR tag (objectId)
  1: "This is not rocket science!",        # Object instance data
  2: [38.8882, -77.01988],                #
  simple(99): signature covering the entire object
})
```

See also [COTX].

- * Permitting signing CBOR data and associated security attributes (aka "headers"), `_in one go_`, without having to wrap data in CBOR "bstr" objects. Non-wrapped data also makes debugging and documentation easier.

Embedded signatures are for example featured in Verified Credentials [CREDENTIALS]. A drawback with designs based on JSON [RFC8259] is that they rely on `_canonicalization schemes_` like JCS [RFC8785], that require specialized encoders and decoders, whereas CBOR::Core works "straight out of the box".

B.1. Sample Signature

Although this specification is not "married" to any particular signature schema, the following example uses the CBOR Signature Format [CSF]. For the sake of simplicity, the example uses an HMAC (see Appendix B.1.4) as signature algorithm.

For a more sophisticated use of CBOR::Core, combining signatures and encryption, see [WALLET].

B.1.1. Unsigned Data

Imagine you have a CBOR map object like the following that you want to sign:

```
{
  1: "data",
  2: "more data"
}
```

B.1.2. Signature Process

This section describes the steps required for adding an embedded signature to the CBOR map object in Appendix B.1.1. To avoid confusing CBOR map keys with cryptographic keys, the former are referred to as "labels".

1. Add an empty CSF container (a CBOR map) to the unsigned CBOR map using the CSF container label `simple(99)`.
2. Add the designated signature algorithm to the CSF container using the CSF algorithm label (1).
3. Optional. Add other signature meta data to the CSF container. Not used in the example.
4. Generate a signature by invoking a (hypothetical) signature method with the following arguments:
 - * the designated signature key.
 - * the designated signature algorithm.
 - * the deterministic encoding of the current CBOR object in its entirety. In the example that would be `a301646461746102696d6f7265206461746120a10105`, if expressed in hex code.
5. Add the returned signature value to the CSF container using the CSF signature label (6).

The result after the final step (using the parameters from Appendix B.1.4), should match the following CBOR object:

```
{
  1: "data",
  2: "more data",
  simple(99): {
    1: 5,
    6: h'237e674c7be1818ddd7eaacf40ca80415b9ad816880751d2136c45385207420c'
  }
}
```

Note that the signature covers the `_entire_` CBOR object except for the CSF signature value and label (6).

B.1.3. Validation Process

In order to validate the embedded signature created in the Appendix B.1.2, the following steps are performed:

1. Fetch a `_reference_` to the CSF container using the CSF container label `simple(99)`. Next perform the following operations using the reference:
 1. Retrieve the signature algorithm using the CSF algorithm label (1).
 2. Retrieve the signature value using the CSF algorithm label (6).
 3. Remove the CSF algorithm label (6) and its associated value.

Now we should have exactly the same CBOR object as we had `_before_` step #4 in Appendix B.1.2. That is:

```
{
  1: "data",
  2: "more data",
  -1: {
    1: 5
  }
}
```

2. Validate the signature data by invoking a (hypothetical) signature validation method with the following arguments:
 - * the designated signature key (in the example taken from Appendix B.1.4).
 - * the signature algorithm retrieved in step #1.
 - * the signature value retrieved in step #1.
 - * the `_deterministic encoding_` of the current CBOR object in its `_entirety_`.

Note: this is a "bare-bones" validation process, lacking the ruggedness of a real-world implementation.

B.1.4. Example Parameters

The signature and validation processes depend on the COSE [RFC9053] algorithm "HMAC 256/256" and an associated 256-bit key, here provided in hex code:

```
7fdd851a3b9d2dafc5f0d00030e22b9343900cd42ede4948568a4a2ee655291a
```

B.2. Code Example

Using a JavaScript implementation [CBOR.JS] of CBOR::Core, together with Node.js [NODE.JS], basic signature creation and validation supporting the example in Appendix B.1, could be performed by the following code:

```
// hmac.mjs
import CBOR from 'cbor-object';
const crypto = await import('node:crypto');

// Application independent CSF constants
const CSF_CONTAINER_LBL = CBOR.Simple(99);
const CSF_ALG_LBL = CBOR.Int(1);
const CSF_SIG_LBL = CBOR.Int(6);

// COSE => Node.js algorithm translation
const HASH_ALGORITHMS = new Map()
  .set(5, "sha256").set(6, "sha384").set(7, "sha512");

function hmac(coseAlg, key, data) {
  let alg = HASH_ALGORITHMS.get(coseAlg);
  if (alg === undefined) throw "Unknown alg: " + coseAlg;
  return crypto.createHmac(alg, key).update(data).digest();
}

const SHARED_KEY = crypto.createSecretKey(
  '7fdd851a3b9d2dafc5f0d00030e22b9343900cd42ede4948568a4a2ee655291a', 'hex');

const APP_P1_LBL = CBOR.Int(1);           // Application label
const APP_P2_LBL = CBOR.Int(2);           //      ""

////////////////////////////////////
// Create an unsigned CBOR object //
////////////////////////////////////
let object = CBOR.Map()
  .set(APP_P1_LBL, CBOR.String("data"))    // Application data
  .set(APP_P2_LBL, CBOR.String("more data")); //      ""

////////////////////////////////////
```

```

// Add a signature to the CBOR object //
// //////////////////////////////////////
const COSE_ALG = 5;                                // Selected HMAC algorithm

let csf = CBOR.Map()                                // Create CSF container and
  .set(CSF_ALG_LBL, CBOR.Int(COSE_ALG));            // add COSE algorithm to it
object.set(CSF_CONTAINER_LBL, csf);                 // Add CSF container to object
let sig = hmac(COSE_ALG,                             // Generate signature over
  SHARED_KEY,                                         // the current object
  object.encode());                                  // encode(): all we got so far
csf.set(CSF_SIG_LBL, CBOR.Bytes(sig));              // Add signature to CSF container
let cborBinary = object.encode();                   // Return CBOR as an Uint8Array

console.log(object.toString());                     // Show in Diagnostic Notation

// //////////////////////////////////////
// Validate the signed CBOR object //
// //////////////////////////////////////
object = CBOR.decode(cborBinary);                  // Decode CBOR object
csf = object.get(CSF_CONTAINER_LBL);                // Get CSF container
let alg = csf.get(CSF_ALG_LBL).getInt32();          // Get COSE algorithm
let readSig = csf.remove(CSF_SIG_LBL).getBytes();   // Get and REMOVE signature value
let actualSig = hmac(alg,                           // Calculate signature over
  SHARED_KEY,                                         // the current object
  object.encode());                                  // encode(): all but the signature
if (CBOR.compareArrays(readSig, actualSig)) {        // HMAC validation
  throw "Signature did not validate";
}
// Validated object, access the "payload":
let pl = object.get(APP_Pl_LBL).getString();        // pl should now contain "data"

```

Note that this code depends heavily on the API features outlined in Section 2.3.1.

Appendix C. Backward Compatibility

It is assumed that most systems using CBOR are able to process an application specific, selection of CBOR data items that are encoded in compliance with [RFC8949]. Since the deterministic encoding scheme mandated by CBOR::Core, also is compliant with [RFC8949], there should be no major interoperability issues. That is, if the previous assumption actually is correct

However, in the `_other_` direction (CBOR::Core tools processing data from systems using "legacy" CBOR encoding schemes), the situation is likely to be considerably more challenging since deterministic encoding "by design" is `_strict_`. Due to this potential obstacle, implementers of CBOR::Core tools, are RECOMMENDED to offer `_decoder_` options that permit "relaxing" the rigidity of deterministic encoding with respect to:

Numbers:

Numbers MUST still be compliant with [RFC8949], including "Rule 2" in section 4.2.2.

Sorted maps:

Duplicate keys MUST still be rejected.

Note that regardless of the format of `_decoded_` CBOR data, compliant CBOR::Core implementations MUST internally maintain the deterministic encoding format. See also Appendix A.4.

Appendix D. Compatible Online Tools

For testing and learning about CBOR::Core, there are currently a number of compatible online tools (subject to availability...).

[PLAYGROUND]:

Browser-based CBOR "playground"

[CSF-LAB]:

Server-based CBOR and [CSF] test system

Appendix E. Compatible Implementations

For using CBOR::Core in applications, there are currently a number of compatible libraries.

[CBOR.JS]:

JavaScript-based implementation supporting browsers as well as [NODE.JS]

[OPENKEYSTORE]:

Java-based implementation that also supports [CSF]

[ANDROID-CBOR]:

Android Java-based implementation that also supports [CSF]

Document History

```
// RFC Editor: Please remove this section before publication

* 00. First cut.

* 01. Editorial. Changed order of columns in invalid encoding.

* 02. Editorial. "unwrapped" changed to "non-wrapped".

* 03:

    Tweaking the abstract.

    Protocol Primitives sub-section added.

    Diagnostic Notation sub-section added.

    Updated CBOR Tool Requirements

    Updated code example to actually use crypto

    Updated Acknowledgements.

    Updated Security Considerations.

* 04:

    Minor addition in CBOR tools

    Updated Acknowledgements

* 05:

    Regression bug fix

* 06:

    Media type added

* 07->00:

    Renamed from "Universal CBOR" to "CBOR Base"

    Design Goals added

    CBOR Sequences added
```

- * 01:
 - #7.nnn (simple) added
 - Language nits
- * 02->00:
 - Renamed from "CBOR Base" to "CBOR Core"
 - Language nits
 - Miscellaneous Items added
- * 01:
 - Language nits
 - <table align="left">
- * 02:
 - Editorial
- * 03:
 - Added Date decode/reencode example
- * 04:
 - Editorial
 - Added bstr and tstr to Protocol Primitives
- * 05:
 - Enveloped => Embedded (signature)
- * 06:
 - Updated Acknowledgements
- * 07:
 - Dropped CBOR/c. Now it is just CBOR::Core
 - Introduced API Level Considerations

Updated Date example, and added Rule 2 to Supporting Existing Systems

* 08:

Elaborated on "levels"

CBOR/Core => CBOR::Core (showing its close ties to software)

* 09:

Embedded signature sample => simple(99)

* 10:

Editorial

CBOR Profile => CBOR Platform Profile

* 11:

Editorial

Supporting Existing Systems => Backward Compatibility

* 12:

NaN with payloads added

* 13:

Editorial

Non-finite number support

* 14:

Editorial

* 15:

Revised: Application/Encoding Level Considerations

Acknowledgements

For verifying the correctness of the encoding scheme, the [CBOR.ME] on-line CBOR tool, by the [RFC8949] author, Carsten Bormann, proved to be invaluable.

Non-exhaustive list of people who directly (and sometimes indirectly) contributed to this specification include: Carsten Bormann, Alan DeKok, Vadim Goncharov, Joe Hildebrand, Eliot Lear, Laurence Lundblade, Rohan Mahy, Michael Richardson, Gran Selander, and Orie Steele.

Author's Address

Anders Rundgren (editor)
Independent
Montpellier
France
Email: anders.rundgren.net@gmail.com
URI: <https://www.linkedin.com/in/andersrundgren/>