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History of RFC 7807

- First I-D Jul 2012, 12 drafts
- RFC since March 2016
- Authors: Mark Nottingham, Erik Wilde
RFC 7807bis: Motivation


Authors: Mark Nottingham, Erik Wilde, Sanjay Dalal

● Multiple problem instances
  ○ The most common use case with 400 class of errors in HTTP APIs. Encountered by most new consumers of an HTTP API
  ○ Also applicable in cases where batch (of something) is submitted to a service using HTTP API
  ○ However, RFC 7807 recommends an “extension” for the use case. This limits the adoption and creates a proliferation of proprietary schemas for error responses in HTTP APIs.
  ○ Hurts developer experience and increases support cost.

● The type of the member `type` needs more clarification (see issues)
Issues needing resolution

- #15, 14, 13, 11 ‘type’ related issues - Tim Perry
- #12 Problem Details Object for Warning - Sanjay Dalal
- #10 JSON-LD context (in appendix) Asbjørn Ulsberg
- #8 JSON schema for Problem Details Object (in appendix) - Sanjay Dalal
- #6 Multiple problems - Sanjay Dalal

Issues: https://github.com/ietf-wg-httpapi/rfc7807bis/issues
New I-D for repository?

- #7 Repository of common problem types - Graham Cox
  - Invalid Request
  - Invalid value { Email address, Phone number, Country code, Currency code, Enumerated values...} (with reference to a standard)
  - Optimistic lock failure (e.g. the If-Match header on a PUT request has the wrong value)

Mark Nottingham’s suggestions

1. Create an IANA registry of problem types, much as for link relations.
2. Create a publicly-coordinated informal repository (eg, in a wiki).
Thanks!

Sanjay Dalal

LinkedIn: https://www.linkedin.com/in/sanjaydalal/