

SEDATE

November 8th, (Tuesday), 1500-1600 UTC
draft-ietf-sedate-datetime-extended-06

- Document has converged
- Problem with RFC 3339 found
- Hard to discuss this problem

What RFC 3339 is

Text format for [utctime, ? localtime]

Profiling ISO 8601:1988 for that (Y2K, unnecessary choices)
(The local offset is a hint once the decoding is done)

An RFC 3339 timestamp is always rooted in a UTC time
• (no "floating times").

optional "local offset" is "often useful information".

• opt out using -00:00 as local offset

What SEDATE is

"IXDTF": Adding extensions to RFC 3339 timestamps

- semantics of RFC 3339 remain unchanged
- time zone hint adds named timezone [Europe/Berlin] to existing local offset (+01:00)
- keys for other options ([key=value]) can be registered
- options can be critical (![key=value]), **must understand**

Are we done yet?

Yes.

Are we done yet?
Yes. But.

The problem

- RFC 3339 defines:
 - **Z** and **+00:00**: synonyms for local offset 0
 - **-00:00**: no local offset given (cf. RFC 2822 email date)
- Implementations tend to read:
 - **Z**: "no time zone offset given"
 - **+00:00**: local offset 0
- ISO 8601 versions since 2000 **do not allow -00:00** — never written

Confusion



We already need to cope with conflicts between

- RFC 3339 offset and
- timezone hint

Temporal interprets `Z + [Timezone]` as RFC3339 `-00:00`
#19 has a survey of various RFC3339-incompatible
platform time data types

Options

1. ignore problem; feign ignorance

2. do the right thing

Radical Proposal

Should we start to interpret **Z** as **-00:00**,
leaving **+00:00** for RFC 3339's **Z/+00:00** semantics?

- Seems to mirror the consensus in the implementations
- Goes outside the charter of SEDATE
- Needs discussion beyond SEDATE WG

The Mail

2022-10-04:

Sent message to ART; CC: SEDATE, CBOR, NTP, TICTOC

<https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/msg/tictoc/K1tNGj0agyraL0Z1AiiPEJE8aBU>

(also about CBOR time tag, which is starting to provide a binary version of SEDATE extensions)

What people wanted to discuss

- IETF standards should not reference non-free standards normatively
- the need for floating times (or their impossibility)
- sub-minute Timezone Offsets
- calendaring issues
- unstable politicians and Timezone definitions

next steps

- Consider the discussion done
- Check with AD/IESG whether we can extend charter, to

— **fix RFC 3339**