Updating RFC 9803

IETF 125, Shenzen

Gavin Brown <gavin.brown@icann.org>

Erratum #8718

- The XML Schema permits only a single “`custom`” RR type, for example:

```
 <element name="create" type="ttl:commandContainer">
  <unique name="uniqueRRTypeForCreate">
    <selector xpath="ttl:ttl"/>
    <field xpath="@for"/>
  </unique>
</element>
```

- It should say:

```
<element name="create" type="ttl:commandContainer">
  <unique name="uniqueRRTypeForCreate">
    <selector xpath="ttl:ttl"/>
    <field xpath="@custom"/>
    <field xpath="@for"/>
  </unique>
</element>
```

- This prevents (e.g.) DELEG records from coexisting with some other type of record that might appear at a delegation.

What’s the fix?

- We should publish RFC 9803-bis to fix this error.
- The new document will have the corrected schema in its Formal Syntax section.
- **Question: should the namespace URI be updated?**
  - i.e. `urn:ietf:params:xml:ns:epp:ttl-1.0` => `urn:ietf:params:xml:ns:epp:ttl-1.1`
- I think it should.

Rationale for changing the namespace URI

Without a namespace change, clients and servers which implement different versions could receive EPP XML instances from the other that they would consider invalid. Examples:

1. Client implements 9803bis, server implements 9803. Client sends `<update>` with multiple custom RRs, server unexpectedly rejects the command.
2. Client implements 9803, server implements 9803bis. Client receives an `<info>` from the server that contains multiple custom RRs, which fails schema validation.

The delta from RFC 9803 will be small (hence “bis”) but it is significant!

Show of hands

Should RFC9803bis change the namespace URI?

Thanks!