SEDATE @ IETF 114

July 25th, (Monday), 17:30-18:30 UTC
(19:30–20:30 CEST, 13:30–14:30 EDT)

Minutes
1. Introduction and Agenda Bashing
    a. https://datatracker.ietf.org/meeting/114/materials/slides-114-sedate-sedate-ietf-114-chair-slides-00.pdf
    b. Mark presented the chair slides. Asked if there's any agenda bashing to do.
    c. No agenda bashing.
2. Presentation about Liaison
    a. https://datatracker.ietf.org/meeting/114/materials/slides-114-sedate-sedate-liaison-report-00.pdf
    b. Mike not present -> will move it to the end and see if he can join.
3. Main item for SEDATE -> Carsten's Slides
    a. See draft-ietf-sedate-datetime-extended-05
    b. Status update -> v04 and v05.
    c. ARE WE DONE YET? YES
        i. Except: what do we do with conflicts between the different bits of the data?
            1. RFC3339 timestamp (UTC referenced)
            2. RFC3339 timezone offset (including -00:00)
            3. SEDATE Time zone hints [Europe/Paris]
    d. Radical proposal: ISO8601 vs RFC3339
        i. Ujjwal - implementations don't get the choice to ignore ISO8601.
        ii. To be maximally compatible, they need to stick with the syntax supported by both, which is why Z is treated how it is.
        iii. Justin Grant: looked at about 10 platform libraries, and took the subset with a timestamp type. Equivalent to 3339 or ISO8601, an instant without a timezone - then looked at how they were serialised. Did not find ANY that used -00:00, all used Z.
            1. There's no conflict for a timestamp, what you use. It all has the same meaning unless there's a timezone involved.
            2. Assumption is that designers of libraries chose to use the shorter and more compatible serialisation of Z.
        iv. Justin: think "demolish" is a little too bold. For the purpose of 3339, they are all equivalent. Because 3339 does not assert any meaning for the string other than a timestamp.
        v. Copied section 4.3 into the chat (which gives semantics to -00:00)
            1. If the time in UTC is known, but the offset to local time is unknown, this can be represented with an offset of "-00:00". This differs semantically from an offset of "Z" or "+00:00", which imply that UTC is the preferred reference point for the specified

time. RFC2822 IMAIL-UPDATE] describes a similar convention for email.

vi. Carsten: so we do have a pretty clear statement.

vii. Ujjwal: I understand that 3339 has been around for quite a while, but the fact that this has been an inconsistency for so long makes me feel exactly the opposite way, for the last 20 years, implementation have been confused with what to do, because these two standards are inconsistent - and they have to do something technically not permitted by EITHER to have maximum compatibility, the longer this continues the worse it is. If we could fix the world by making the standards compatible. Implementations would be easier to write.

viii. Bron -> it's clear that Z isn't being used how the spec says.

ix. Carsten: RFC3339 did something that ISO8601 doesn't allow. The fact that 3339 is SUPPOSED to be a profile does something that isn't allowed by the base standards. Is that a requirement.

x. Murray: does anything break?

xi. Ujjwal: based on the survey that Justin did, nothing would break -> in fact would fix the inconsitency by allowing implementors to just do RFC3339.

xii. Justin: strongly recommend that we DON'T remove -00:00, but recognise that 'Z' has been used to just say "it's in this time".

xiii. It's clear that the offset means an exact offset, but not that 'Z' does.

xiv. Murray: when we move from "proposed standard" to "internet standard". This working group is chartered to do this work.

xv. Ujjwal -> seems to be some convergence. We'll need to include some examples and notes.

xvi. Carsten: my next step would be to make the pull requests which adds the section that updates 3339 by weaking the semantics of 'Z'.

xvii. Ken and Bron -> Z does mean UTC for the time. At least in calendaring and vcard as well.

xviii. Ujwall, we're not trying to say that it doesn't mean UTC -> it's still UTC, it just doesn't assert the timezone.
   1. But for code which allows "not aligning" you can always put a Z but still give a zone.

xix. Justin -> agree strongly, this came out from some comments that Justin made on Carsten's latest pull request. Saw example using Z. Fully agree that we should have examples in the text, with full text explaining what we mean here. There's suggested starting point text in the pull request too.

xx. Ujjwal -> just to comment on Bron's message, that's the most common use case that I'm thinking about. A lot of implementations would be dealing with instants, an separately storing a timezone to refer to the context.

e. WG Chair Summary (Mark)
   i. I think we're very close, think we all essentially agree with Carsten's propopsal, with some additions:

      ii.   The examples and text are essential, from Murray some context that explains the deviation between 3339 and what implementors went ahead and did.

     iii.   A future draft should have a paragraph the explains what happened in the last 15 years for context and how we got to where we are today (sort of a motivation for the decisions SEDATE has made).

     iv.   Bron: we don't need to change 3339 at all, just if you see a 'Z' then you don't need to ensure the zone matches.

      v.   Carsten: used "Demolish" as a joke, but there is something that section 4.3 says. We are updating that, we have to be straightforward about that.

4. Liaison Statement (Mike)
   a. Approved April 1st!
   b. Haven't had much dealings with TC154.
   c. Have had 5 meetings since, but not much on ISO8601 work. Mostly on ISO34000 vocal and terms.
   d. They did raise the topic of 24:00:00 where apparently there's a legal requirement in Germany.
      i. Don't think it matters for us, since we don't have to go down that rabbit hole.
   e. ISO doesn't freely share standards, trying to get a copy and see what can be shared with sedate. Didn't realise how hard it was to get a copy! Trying to get a working copy and share to this group.
      i. Bron - what we need is a commitment not to conflict with the syntax that we define. Feel like there won't be anything of that kind.
      ii. IAB is well aware that this problem exists.
      iii. Mark will reach out to IAB's liaison.
      iv. Mike will try a contact that Ron has.
      v. Nothing in ISO document repository.
   f. If there's anything for Mike to take back, would like a statement.
5. Meeting close
6. Anything further, on the mailing list.