

SEDATE INTERIM

Bron did the note-well

No agenda bashing

Mark spoke about the liaison - IAB have appointed somebody - will be announced next week.

draft-datetime-extended

Carsten presenting slides

pr10

Scope: restrict scope of existing draft, say that this is scope.

Neil: does this mean that the scope doesn't cover everything that Temporal need?

Carsten: maybe they can answer.

Ujjwal: main thing is to standardise the informational and the extension format itself, that's a great start. Want to get the format in shape as much as possible and ship temporal.

Carsten: the way this is set up, other organisations can add other extensions. This document just defines a registry and the basic timezone name mechanism, and the existing timezone because it has a different syntax.

pr11

Extname registry - can define a policy.

Bron: the definition of 'alphanum' means that we need to base32 or something for 8bit.

Mike: why namespace? What if two different namespaces add 'calendar'?

Ujjwal: inspired by BCP47. If conflicting, the first one is right.

Mike: more "why namespaces at all"? Just define in the registry.

Carsten: depends how restrictive it is. We could go with RFC required . Otherwise with specification required, designated expert would check. So could have instruction "don't register conflicting mechanisms".

Mike: it's re-inventing the x- problem. People just used x-, and it went into production like that. We'd be better off not even allowing it. **Register provisionally?**

Carsten: proposal - use 'x-' but only for closed experiments.

Bron: at least with x-, you can tell that it's been made up by somebody.

Neil: this problem comes up every time. It's common to every data format and protocol. This is a data format, so you can't negotiate. We should make it easy to standardise properly.

Mike: a "reserved" option to allow people to say that they're working on something.

Carsten: agree that provisional registration should be

John K: the 'x-' stuff started with email. It's a bad idea. Think you have to have a registry where you can indicate provisional and a timeout for when it expires.

Mike: namespacing is just 'x-' in disguise and has the same problems.

Ujjwal: appears people are against namespacing in general. It's not a strong position on the temporary side. It's definitely a possibility that you could just stick to the two extensions that they have in mind and a single registry.

Carsten: registering a namespace doesn't stop you from having to register extensions, you just have a namespace that you can put your own extensions under.

Mike: if it's generally useful, it shouldn't be namespaced. Don't want to wind up with two namespaces and two similar things that cover the same things but are slightly different.

Carsten: way to avoid this is having the designated expert not do that.

Carsten - simpler the better.

Take out the dash in the key? Mike - still has value to allow you to structure it, just don't call it a namespace.

Shane Carr: the idea of namespaces is inspired by BCP47. An advantage of having namespaces is that unicode could add additional keys under its namespace with a more lightweight process, for example. If we have a low-cost process, then namespaces are not needed. But should consult with BCP47 authors.

Carsten: the registry is intended as this low-cost option.

Mike: a provisional registry would be that.

John: Strongly encourage people reading RFC 6838, which provides a complete map of the rat holes that this discussion walks along the edges of ... including namespaces

Carsten: as editor, have some direction. Can propose a few things.

John: want to avoid two different organisations using the same string to mean different things! How far into requiring specifications - if you make it too hard people will ignore you can do whatever they feel like. Provisional registries can be a good way to stop people accidentally doing the same thing but different.

DECISION: get rid of namespaces, radically simplify. Carsten understands enough to make reasonable proposals. Media type registry is a good example of how to herd the cats! They have provisional registrations and vendor trees (which we probably don't want)

open issues

all three extensions are out of scope from sedate charter.

Assumption is that all three would go into extensions. With floating time, discuss how to make it not look like an RFC3339 date?

Can probably only do it once chartered to do so.

we need a name!

Please go home and think about one.

need at least one extension defined in the document to show how

If anyone has an idea, that would be great. Mike "floating time", but that's not possible!

issues with TZDB name stability?

less of an issue if we aren't overriding offsets with names. But we will need to develop a position on that.

is this for users, or for programs?

if we want to enable utf8 in the values, then we might need to do more!

Justin: on the temporal side, assuming this is for programs. Separate software to present human values. Not viewed as end-user facing.

Extension -> propose calendar extension because we need it!

ABNF for timezone extensions does not allow numeric, and java.time does follow this - have filed an issue in Github.

critical vs elective for extensions

This is an instruction for the case where the parser doesn't understand.

Neil: think changing the syntax within the extension is likely to cause issues.

Neil: suspect it won't help in practice!

Carsten: point is to avoid false interoperability.

Bron: propose that you can register an option starting with an '!' and that's critical.

Justin: one option is to break it in another way!

Mike: every vendor tries to helpfully correct broken syntax.

John: I would hope that whatever we do does not need to be as complicated and option-filled as media types. But it does lay out many of the options and a way of handling them that has mostly worked for a long time.

You could, .e.,g use curly rather than square braces. Not subtle at all. And, yes, I'm probably joking. I hope.

(this meeting is scheduled for 90 minutes, so we can keep going)

Next meeting!

Further discussion to take place on the list.

Bron and Mark will discuss in a few weeks whether we need an interim in January?

Carsten come up with a rev on the draft - we'll see if another meeting is needed.

Carsten - hoping to have draft for Christmas, read over the break.

Discuss re-chartering after.

Justin: will string-format of calendar annotation change? u-ca or something else?

Carsten: get rid of dash or not? If life is easier if you have the dash, then maybe allow it as a character that you can use.

Justin: Easiest is don't change anything! If it will change, would like to know soon!

... and should I feel a PR for java compat? yes please!

other business

Ujjwal: keep hearing discussion for non-instance work? Do we want to discuss next steps on that?

Carsten: need to spread around the idea that we're looking for a recharter.

Are we SURE this doesn't fall under the current charter of calext?

Bron: would be happy to take the rest of the work in CALEXT after this.

Ujjwal: agree with that - get this published then can look at doing the calendar-format related stuff in calext.

...

(from jabber)

Carsten Bormann

John: I had exactly the same idea. And I'm not joking...

08:10:27

Kenneth Murchison

As did I

08:10:50

Ujjwal Sharma

uhhhhh

08:10:53

me too, should we think more seriously about this?

08:11:06

John C Klensin

Happy to be in the rough on this. But, again, I think the key is to do something not-subtle

08:11:27

I am, however, a bit concerned about depending on the use of characters that don't appear in ISO 646 BV

Carsten Bormann

Is that thing still alive?

08:15:43

John C Klensin

I was more concerned about the repertoire than the specific standards, but, short-answer is "yes", sadly