

EPP Service Messages Extension

draft-mayrhofer-eppext-servicemessage-00

alexander.mayrhofer@nic.at

IETF 91, Honolulu, HI

Format History

- EPP implementation for .at (circa 2007?)
 - EPP base specs: No definition of „poll“ message structure (some examples)
 - Various use cases for „poll“ mechanism
 - Created simple schema for „service messages“
- In use .at since 6+ years
 - „Evolved“ over time
 - Also deployed for several new gTLDs
- Draft documents what’s „out there“

Service Message Example I

(Expired Domain Notification)

```
<resData>
  ..
  <message type="HasExpired">
    <desc>The following domains have expired as of
      2016-02-25: test-expire1.example, test-
      expire2.example
    </desc>
    <data>
      <entry name="date">2016-02-25</entry>
      <entry name="domain">test-expire1.example</entry>
      <entry name="domain">test-expire2.example</entry>
    </data>
  </message>
</resData>
```

Service Message Example II

(Subordinate hosts transferred with domain)

```
<resData>
  <domain:trnData>
    ..
  </domain:trnData>
  <message type="TransferApproved">
    <desc>Inbound transfer of test.example was
    APPROVED. Subordinate hosts ns1.test.example,
    ns2.test.example were also transferred.
    </desc>
    <data>
      <entry name="host">ns1.test.example</entry>
      <entry name="host">ns2.test.example</entry>
    </data>
  </message>
</resData>
```

Other use cases / options

- Include full EPP frames in „data“ element
 - Server queues EPP response frame when EPP session was interrupted during transaction
 - „any“ element loophole...
- Include clTRID / svTRID pair
 - Allows for reference to a specific EPP transaction
- Specific „request“ / „response“ element pair
 - Intended to replace EPP frames in „data“ element
 - Response frame without request not always useful

Feedback & Purpose

- Feedback on eppext
 - Useful, but „too flexible“
 - Excellent suggestions to improve schema, but...
 - (Note: Include „Registry of Message Types“?)
- Purpose of draft (and EPPEXT registry)?
 - Document what’s operational reality (even if it’s not perfect)?
 - Specify what would be nice to have?

Q to WG: What next?

- a. „Operational Reality“: Keep direction of draft
 - Editorial changes only - no structural changes to schema
 - Provides practical documentation for registrars (and registries?)

- b. „Perfect World“: Create modified format based on community consensus
 - Change Schema significantly / new Schema
 - Doesn't reflect current deployment – Adapt implementations (...)?

- c. Do both?