Web Service Shell - Bug #163
Date formats are leniant

02/04/2013 11:20 AM - Celso Reyes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status:</th>
<th>Closed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignee:</td>
<td>Rich Karstens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target version:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution:</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start date:</td>
<td>02/04/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Done:</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated time:</td>
<td>0.00 hour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description
Although the spec specifies YYYY-MM-DD, the following are also accepted:
…/wss074/query? time=
  - 1970-01-01T00:00:00
  - 1970-01-01T00:00
  - 19E5-01-01T00:00:00 (see bug #161)
  - 1985-01-01x00:00:00 (see bug #162)

Expected
Only the following would be accepted:
  - YYYY-MM-DD
  - YYYY-MM-DDTHH:MM:SS
  - YYYY-MM-DDTHH:MM:SS.sss (arbitrary number of decimal places, from non to to microsecond)

History
#1 - 02/04/2013 11:34 AM - Rich Karstens
- Resolution set to Not a Bug
- Assignee set to Rich Karstens
- Status changed from New to Resolved

Yes, it's lenient. See #162 for the date example
A bit surprising, but the deep down of Java also parses exponential years in the dates.

Resolution is the same: not a bug. There was never any intent to validate various date strings to that level. Though, there could be if there was any interest. And then, as a new feature.

#2 - 02/04/2013 11:45 AM - Chad Trabant
After some discussion decide to change date validation to a check that the string matches one of these regular expressions:

/\d{4}\-[01]\d\-[0-3]\d\(T\s\[0-2]\d:\[0-5]\d:\[0-5]\d\.\d\(+Z\)\]$%/n/\d{4}\-[01]\d\-[0-3]\d\(T\s\[0-2]\d:\[0-5]\d:\[0-5]\d(\+Z)\]$%/n/\d{4}\-[01]\d\-[0-3]\d(\+Z)$%/n

These test for the these three patterns:

YYYY-MM-DD[TH]:HH:MM:SS.sssssss[Z]
YYYY-MM-DD[TH]:HH:MM:SS[Z]
YYYY-MM-DD[Z]

and they apply a bit of limitation to avoid obviously bad dates (e.g. month 24 will not pass), also a trailing ‘Z’ for UTC timezone is allowed and The T can be a space. So a bit more lenient than the spec.
#3 - 02/04/2013 11:56 AM - Rich Karstens
- Resolution changed from Not a Bug to Fixed

Doing a tight test on the Date format now.
Will be in 0.7.5

#4 - 02/04/2013 01:04 PM - Celso Reyes
- Status changed from Resolved to Closed

All better.
The following fail with a 400 as expected:

YYYY-JJJ
YYYY-MM-DDT00:00
YYYYY-MM-DD
-YYYY-MM-DD
YYYY-Y-MM-DD
YYYY-MM-DDx00:00:00
YYEY-MM-DD