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1. Introduction

(See abstract for now.)

1.1. Terminology

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
[RFC2119] when they appear in ALL CAPS. These words may also appear
in this document in lower case as plain English words, absent their
normative meanings.

The term "byte" is used in its now customary sense as a synonym for
"octet".

CoAP: Constrained Application Protocol [RFC7252]

CBOR: Concise Binary Object Representation [RFC7049]

CoRE: Constrained RESTful Environments, the field of work underlying
[RFC6690], [RFC7049], [RFC7252], and [RFC7641]

IoT: Internet of Things

JSON: JavaScript Object Notation [RFC7159]
2. Group Communication Management Objects in CBOR

2.1. Background

The CoAP Group Communications specification [RFC7390] defines group management objects in JSON format. These objects are used to represent IP multicast group information for CoAP endpoints. See [I-D.ietf-core-resource-directory] for more examples of using these objects.

2.2. Information Model

This section discusses the information model underlying the CoAP Group Communication management object payload.

A group membership JSON object contains one or more key/value pairs, and represents a single IP multicast group membership for the CoAP endpoint. Each key/value pair is encoded as a member of the JSON object, where the key is the member name and the value is the member’s value.

The information model of the CoAP Group Communication management object can be summarized in CDDL [I-D.greevenbosch-appsawg-cbor-cddl] below:

```
collection = { * index => membership }
index = tstr .regexp "[A-Za-z0-9]{1,2}"
membership = {
    ? n: groupname,
    ? a: groupaddress,
}
groupname = tstr ; host [":" port]
groupaddress = tstr ; IPv4address [":" port ]
    ; / IPv6address [":" port ]
```

Figure 1: CoAP Group Communication Data Model

2.3. Mapping

The objective of the mapping defined in this section is to map information from the JSON formats specified in [RFC7390] into CBOR format, using the rules of Section 4.2 of [RFC7049].

2.4. Group Communication Example
{ "8": { "a": "[ff15::4200:f7fe:ed37:14ca]" },
   "11": { "n": "sensors.floor1.west.bldg6.example.com",
             "a": "[ff15::4200:f7fe:ed37:25cb]" },
   "12": { "n": "All-Devices.floor1.west.bldg6.example.com",
             "a": "[ff15::4200:f7fe:ed37:abcd]:4567" }
}

Figure 2: Example from section 2.6.2.4 of [RFC7390]

becomes:


Figure 3: Group Communication Management Object Encoded in CBOR

3. IANA Considerations

This specification registers the following additional Internet Media Types:

TBD

4. Security Considerations

The security considerations relevant to the data models of [RFC7390], as well as those of [RFC7049] and [RFC7159] apply.
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