

Network Working Group
Internet-Draft
Intended status: Standards Track
Expires: 1 January 2026

M. Wullink
SIDN Labs
P. Kowalik
DENIC
30 June 2025

RESTful Provisioning Protocol (RPP) - Requirements
draft-ietf-rpp-requirements-01

Abstract

This document describes the requirement for the development of the RESTful Provisioning Protocol (RPP).

Status of This Memo

This Internet-Draft is submitted in full conformance with the provisions of BCP 78 and BCP 79.

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts. The list of current Internet-Drafts is at <https://datatracker.ietf.org/drafts/current/>.

Internet-Drafts are draft documents valid for a maximum of six months and may be updated, replaced, or obsoleted by other documents at any time. It is inappropriate to use Internet-Drafts as reference material or to cite them other than as "work in progress."

This Internet-Draft will expire on 1 January 2026.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2025 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

This document is subject to BCP 78 and the IETF Trust's Legal Provisions Relating to IETF Documents (<https://trustee.ietf.org/license-info>) in effect on the date of publication of this document. Please review these documents carefully, as they describe your rights and restrictions with respect to this document. Code Components extracted from this document must include Revised BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the Trust Legal Provisions and are provided without warranty as described in the Revised BSD License.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	3
2. Terminology	3
3. Conventions Used in This Document	3
4. General	4
5. HTTP	4
6. REST	5
7. Data Model	5
8. Data Representation	6
9. Operations and responses	7
10. Discoverability	7
11. EPP compatibility	8
12. Security	9
13. Extensibility	10
14. Scalability	11
15. Performance	11
16. Internationalisation	12
17. Clients	12
18. Requirements for object types	12
18.1. Domain Object Type	12
18.1.1. Internationalisation	12
18.2. Host Object Type	12
18.3. Contact Object Type	12
18.3.1. Data Representation	13
18.3.2. Internationalisation	13
19. IANA Considerations	13
20. Security Considerations	13
21. Changes History	13
21.1. Version -00 to -01	13
21.2. Version -01 to -00 (WG)	13
21.3. Version -00 to -01	14
Overall Structural Changes	14
Major Changes by Section (References as per -01)	14
General	14
HTTP	14
REST	14
Data Model	15
Data Representation	15
Operations and responses	15
Discoverability	16
EPP compatibility	16
Security	16
Extensibility	17
Scalability	17
Performance	17
Internationalisation	17
Clients	18

Requirements for object types	18
Appendix A. Extensions	18
22. Normative References	18
Appendix A. Extensions	20
Authors' Addresses	20

1. Introduction

This document describes the set of requirements for the RESTful Provisioning Protocol (RPP), an Application Programming Interface (API) for provisioning objects in a shared database. RPP is based on the HTTP [RFC9110] protocol and the architectural principles of [REST].

2. Terminology

In this document the following terminology is used.

REST - Representational State Transfer ([REST]). An architectural style.

RESTful - A RESTful web service is a web service or API implemented using HTTP and the principles of [REST].

EPP RFCs - This is a reference to the EPP version 1.0 specifications [RFC5730], [RFC5731], [RFC5732] and [RFC5733].

RESTful Provisioning Protocol or RPP - The protocol described in this document.

URL - A Uniform Resource Locator as defined in [RFC3986].

Resource - An object having a type, data, and possible relationship to other resources, identified by a URL.

RPP client - An HTTP user agent performing an RPP request

RPP server - An HTTP server responsible for processing requests and returning results in any supported media type.

3. Conventions Used in This Document

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in [RFC2119].

4. General

R1.1. A well defined architecture MUST be defined for RPP, including a description of the responsibilities of the defined protocol layers.

R1.2. RPP MUST provide a clear, clean, easy to use and self-explanatory interface that can easily be integrated into existing software systems.

R1.3. Wherever applicable RPP SHOULD leverage existing best practices and well adopted standards for building and documenting RESTful APIs. There MUST be a clear justification when deviating from this.

R1.4. RPP MUST include support for application level status codes, and MAY reuse the EPP status codes defined in [RFC5730].

R1.5. RPP MUST include support for providing detailed information about application status codes, for example as described in [RFC7807]

R1.6. RPP MUST support additional information about a successful operation (information or warning) to convey additional information to the client for example about deprecation or partial success.

5. HTTP

R2.1. The Hypertext Transfer Protocol (HTTP) [RFC9110] MUST be used as the transport mechanism for RPP.

R2.2. RPP SHOULD use the best common practices for designing HTTP based applications, described in [BCP56]. There MUST be a clear justification when deviating from this.

R2.3. Consistent, predictable and meaningful URL structures MUST be used for identifying, accessing object resources and enable request routing.

R2.4. RPP MUST use the existing HTTP status codes and MUST define application level status codes and map these to HTTP status codes. RPP MUST NOT redefine existing HTTP status code semantics and when overloading (generic) HTTP status codes with multiple RPP status codes, the provided RPP status code MUST be used by the client to determine the exact nature of the problem.

6. REST

R3.1. The RPP architecture MUST use the principles of the [REST] architectural style. A RPP server MUST conform to at least level 2 of the [RICHARDSON] Maturity Model (RMM).

R3.2. The RPP architecture MUST follow Resource-Oriented Architecture [ROI].

R3.3. The RPP specification MUST strive to minimise round trips between client and server. Approaches, where client would need to make multiple requests each time to discover resource URL or server capabilities in order to perform operation SHOULD be used sparingly and be always well justified.

R3.4. _Merged with R12.1_

R3.5. RPP specifications SHOULD incorporate a machine-readable and well-established API specification, such as [!@OpenAPI] or [RAML]. This will facilitate documentation, testing, code generation, and user-friendly extension descriptions. RPP MUST NOT require what API specification technology is to be used. The RPP core documents and extension documents may also choose different API specification solutions, this choice is left to the document authors.

7. Data Model

R4.1. The base data model structures MUST be data format agnostic. It MUST be possible to map the base data model to multiple data formats such as JSON, XML or YAML.

R4.2. Commonly used EPP extensions SHOULD be added to the RPP core data model. An example of this is the DNSSEC extension.

R4.3. RPP MUST allow an extension mechanism that allows clients to signal data omission or redaction, indicating data collected but not transmitted to the registry or redacted.

| TODO: Issue #34 (<https://github.com/ietf-wg-rpp/rpp-requirements/issues/34>)

R4.4. RPP MUST have mechanisms to define profiles to indicate:

- * Required parts of the data model
- * Mapping definition
- * Functional subsets for compatibility.

| TODO: Issue #15 (<https://github.com/ietf-wg-rpp/rpp-requirements/issues/15>)

R4.5 The RPP architecture MUST include loose coupling between the server and the client, allowing for non-coordinated introduction of non-breaking version changes on both sides.

R4.6 A RPP MUST have either a lenient validation mode, where unknown properties are ignored, or a strict validation mode, where unknown properties are treated as an error. The mode is up to client and server policy with mode signalling."

8. Data Representation

R5.1 RPP MUST use JSON as the default data format.

R5.2 It MUST be possible to extend RPP to include support for other data formats (e.g. XML, YAML).

R5.3 Validation of request and response message MUST be supported for both clients and the servers, in order to determine if the content is valid and no required attributes are missing.

| TODO: Issue #36 (<https://github.com/ietf-wg-rpp/rpp-requirements/issues/36>)

R5.4 RPP MUST define a default media type however the protocol SHALL be extensible to enable support for other media types.

R5.5 A client MUST be able to signal to the server what media type the server should expect for the request content and to use for the response content.

R5.6 Removed

R5.7 RPP SHOULD consider mechanisms for supporting data formats outside of core RPP domain. Especially formats, which lose their properties if transformed, like Verifiable Credentials for contacts which are digitally signed.

R5.8 RPP MUST support partial update of data objects.

R5.9 RPP MUST support full update of data objects.

R5.10 A generated RPP response representation that includes an object identifier (for example a contact handle) MUST also include a URL reference to the location of the object representation.

9. Operations and responses

R6.1 RPP MUST include support for a client requesting different depth of data representations, depending on the use case:

- * Minimal representation (ID, or ID+name)
- * Full representation (all data of the object)
- * Full representation + dereferenced referrals (for example domain with contact and host details)

R6.2 RPP MAY return different representations of the same object in different contexts:

- * GET request to the resource itself
- * GET request to get a collection of objects
- * Responses to PUT/POST/PATCH requests

R6.3 The data representation in a RPP response MUST only contain data related to the object, transactional information MUST be represented as one or more separate HTTP headers.

| TODO: Issue #56 (<https://github.com/ietf-wg-rpp/rpp-requirements/issues/56>)

10. Discoverability

R7.1 RPP MAY include a bootstrap mechanism designed to allow clients to locate the network identifier for the RPP service of a registry operator, e.g. rpp.sidn.nl for the registry operator for the .nl ccTLD.

Solutions may include:

- * IANA bootstrap Service Registry
- * DNS TXT records

R7.2 An RPP server MUST publish a service discovery document in the well-known directory, described in [RFC5785]. This document contains structured machine readable information that is required or useful for the client to be able to generate valid RPP requests. The information may contain, but is not limited to:

- * Available services,
- * Used Extensions
- * Versions used for services and extensions
- * Environment name (production, test etc.)
- * Server datetime
- * Maintenance notices

- * Supported profiles

R7.3 Server provided functionality, such as the set of supported profiles, languages or extensions, MUST discoverable using the discovery document.

R7.4 RPP MUST support versioning of:

- * The protocol itself
- * Data object types
- * Representations
- * Operations
- * Profiles
- * Extensions

R7.5 Versioning schema MUST carry information about breaking vs. non-breaking changes and allow clients to decide whether it is able to interact with the server. The versioning scheme SHOULD be like the scheme used for HTTP where minor version changes do not break compatibility.

R7.6 Notices related to scheduled server maintenance timeslots MAY be included in the discovery document, this could be a human readable, non machine parsable character string.

R7.7 RPP MAY only support a subset of EPP functionality, the supported functionality MUST be discoverable by the client

R7.8 _Removed_

R7.9 An RPP response that includes unique object identifiers, MAY also include URL references for these objects.

R7.10 Versions used by the RPP protocol and used extensions MUST be discoverable by the client.

11. EPP compatibility

R8.1 RPP MUST provide functional equivalents for core EPP functionalities related to domain name, host, and contact objects as defined in [RFC5731], [RFC5732] and [RFC5733].

R8.2 The automatic or mechanical mapping or conversion between EPP and RPP data model MUST be possible.

R8.3 Compatibility definitions for a RPP to EPP mapping MAY be defined in compatibility profiles (see: R4.4).

| TODO: Issue #15 (<https://github.com/ietf-wg-rpp/rpp-requirements/issues/15>)

R8.4 RPP MUST include an extension framework able to define equivalents of most commonly used EPP extensions, which are not a part of core protocol (see: R4.2)

R8.5 EPP password based Authorisation Information defined in [RFC5731] and [RFC5733] MUST be supported in RPP.

R8.6 RPP SHOULD support client_id/password authentication to match EPP client authentication.

12. Security

R9.1 RPP MUST support state-of-the-art authentication and authorisation schemes allowing for easy integration in modern HTTP infrastructure.

R9.2 RPP MUST support modern authentication and authorisation standards (OAuth, OpenId Connect)

R9.3 Support for a simplified and quicker object transfer process MAY be included, where approval from the losing registrar is to be obtained interactively by the registrant during the transfer process.

R9.4 RPP MUST include an authorisation model/framework that goes beyond the current EPP password based Authorisation Information (AuthInfo) used for object transfers. The following use cases MAY be supported:

- * Object transfers without using an EPP password based Authorisation Information
- * Registrants using OpenID Connect can interactively allow DNS operator to update their NS records, directly in the registry database or indirectly using a registrar.

R9.5 RPP MUST employ strong authentication and utilise encrypted transport (HTTPS) to protect sensitive data.

R9.6 Security mechanisms SHOULD be flexible to allow operators to choose appropriate methods and support federated authentication scenarios.

R9.7 RPP MAY include a mechanism for cryptographic verification of request and response messages as an additional security layer.

R9.8 RPP MUST allow for multiple user accounts linked to a single registrar, registrar user management MAY be delegated to an administrator account linked to a registrar, allowing for self service account management by the registrar.

R9.9 RPP MUST support a granular authorisation matrix, where one or more permissions are coupled to a user account. Allowing for the creation of different types of user accounts, such a readonly users only allowed to fetch data about existing objects, and power users allowed to create and modify objects.

R9.10 RPP MUST allow users to update their credentials and enforce strong passwords and limited lifetime for passwords and other tokens.

13. Extensibility

R10.1 The protocol MUST be extensible to accommodate new functionalities, data elements, and operations beyond the initial scope.

R10.2 RPP MUST allow for flexibility in extending the data model e.g. adding new objects or a new attribute to an existing object MUST be possible.

R10.3 RPP SHOULD promote standardisation of commonly used extension attributes.

R10.4 Extensions for new operations on existing resources MUST be supported.

| TODO: Issue #47 (<https://github.com/ietf-wg-rpp/rpp-requirements/issues/47>)

R10.5 RPP MUST support extensions that define new status codes not already defined in the core RPP RFCs.

R10.6 RPP MUST support extensions adding new HTTP headers.

R10.7 RPP SHALL have mechanisms to assure conflict avoidance when extending the protocol, including but not limited to data model, representations, operations, parameters, error codes and signalling. There MUST be a mechanism of conflict-free, non-coordinated extending in private/vendor discretion as well as a coordinated process for core, generic or shared elements.

R10.8 When a public registry for RPP extensions is required, then IANA MUST be used for this function.

R10.9 RPP extensions MUST include support for versioning, the version of the extension supported by the server MUST be included in the discovery document.

R10.10 Removed

R10.11 Extension designers or RPP implementers MAY add new status codes, if a newly created status code is generic enough to be useful for the wider RPP community, then the extension designer SHOULD register the new status code in the RPP IANA registry.

14. Scalability

R11.1 RPP MUST be stateless and MUST NOT maintain application state on the server required for processing future RPP requests. Every client request needs to provide all the information required for the server to be able to successfully process the request. The client MAY maintain application session state, for example by using a JWT token.

R11.2 RPP MUST support cacheability of responses, if applicable to the operation semantics and MUST not include transaction related identifiers and values.

| TODO: Issue #50 (<https://github.com/ietf-wg-rpp/rpp-requirements/issues/50>)

R11.3 RPP MUST support load balancing at the level of request messages (URL) and load balancing MUST be possible without processing HTTP body.

R11.4 Every request message MUST at most contain a single object for the server to operate on, with the exception of operations that are explicitly defined as a bulk operation.

R11.5 RPP MUST support asynchronous processing for operations on multiple objects, otherwise resource intensive or involving manual steps. The client request results in a confirmation of receipt and a means for retrieving the final completed processing result at a later time.

15. Performance

R12.1 In order to minimise message sizes and needed processing RPP SHOULD be designed not to include a HTTP message body in the request or response when this is not necessary, for example when the required data can be transmitted using the URL and/or HTTP headers.

R12.2 RPP MAY allow for common bulk operations, resource listing, and filtering capabilities. RPP MUST NOT mandate such functionalities where this may impact scalability or performance negatively.

R12.3 _Removed_

16. Internationalisation

R13.1 RPP MUST support internationalisation, for object types and messages defined in the core protocol and extensions

R13.2 RPP MUST support human-readable localised response messages.

17. Clients

R14.1 RPP MUST support server applications as clients. This will be a primary use-case of registry/registrar integration.

R14.2 RPP MUST support interaction from command-line tools or desktop applications capable of sending HTTP requests. These can be generic clients such as curl or Postman but also specialised RPP command line tools or scripts.

R14.3 RPP SHOULD support web browsers as clients, such as SPA (single page applications) without any proxy backend between web browser and the RPP server.

R14.4 RPP SHOULD support mobile applications as clients, also here through direct integration without any proxy backend.

18. Requirements for object types

18.1. Domain Object Type

18.1.1. Internationalisation

D13.1 RPP MUST support Internationalised Domain Names (IDNs) - both UTF-8 as well as Punycode representation of a domain name MUST be supported, however one of them MAY be chosen as primary for object URL

18.2. Host Object Type

18.3. Contact Object Type

18.3.1. Data Representation

C5.1 RPP SHOULD consider using JSContact [RFC9553] format for contact representation.

18.3.2. Internationalisation

C13.1 RPP MUST support internationalisation (character encoding) for Contact objects in the following areas:

- * name
- * address data
- * any other contact-related data containing human provided or readable text

C13.2 RPP MUST support internationalised Email addresses [RFC6530] in Contact objects.

C13.3 RPP MUST support multiple localised expressions of the same data, e.g. fields mentioned in C13.1 having both international and localised variants.

19. IANA Considerations

| TODO: TBC if anything needed here

20. Security Considerations

| TODO: TBC if anything needed here. There is a security
| section.

21. Changes History

This section is to be removed before publishing as an RFC.

21.1. Version -00 to -01

- * R1.5 has been changed to MUST instead of MAY.
- * R1.6 has been changed to MUST instead of SHOULD.
- * Updated the entire text to make consistent use of the British spelling style.

21.2. Version -01 to -00 (WG)

- * The document has been adopted by the working group, the version number has been reset from -01 to -00.

21.3. Version -00 to -01

Overall Structural Changes

- * Requirement Numbering: All requirements have been assigned a structured numbering format (e.g., Rx.x, Dx.x, Cx.x, Hx.x).
- * New Sections Added:
 - Operations and responses
 - Clients
 - Internationalisation
 - Requirements for object types (with subsections for Domain, Host, Contact)
 - Appendix A. Extensions
- * Section Removed: The old Other section, which contained a list of discussion points, was removed and requirements placed in relevant sections or appendix.

Major Changes by Section (References as per -01)

General

- * Modified R1.2: Removed the explicit requirement for language bindings.
- * Replaced Requirement (R1.3): Replaced the specific requirement to leverage HTTP, JSON, OpenAPI with a broader R1.3 (SHOULD leverage RESTful best practices, MUST justify deviation).
- * New Requirement R1.4: Added requirement: RPP MUST support application-level status codes (MAY reuse EPP codes).
- * New Requirement R1.5: Added requirement: RPP MAY support detailed status information (e.g., [RFC7807]).
- * New Requirement R1.6: Added requirement: RPP SHOULD support informational/warning messages on success.

HTTP

- * Modified R2.2: Added requirement: Deviation from HTTP best practices ([BCP56]) MUST be justified.
- * Rewritten R2.4: Significantly rewrote the status code requirement. Now MUST use existing HTTP codes AND define application-level codes, clarifying mapping and overload handling.

REST

- * Modified R3.1: Removed the negative recommendation against Richardson Maturity Model (RMM) Level 3.

- * New Requirement R3.2: Added requirement: RPP MUST follow Resource-Oriented Architecture [ROI].
- * New Requirement R3.3: Added requirement: RPP MUST strive to minimise client-server round trips.
- * Merged Requirement R3.4: Old requirement "When the semantics... MUST be optional" merged into R12.1.
- * Modified R3.5: Broadened API specification recommendation (SHOULD) to include [RAML]; added constraint: RPP MUST NOT mandate a specific API specification technology.

Data Model

- * Modified R4.2: Changed normative keyword from MAY to SHOULD regarding adding common EPP extensions (like DNSSEC) to the core data model.
- * Rewritten R4.3: Replaced old data omission requirement (SHOULD) with R4.3 (MUST allow `_extension mechanism_` for omission/redaction).
- * New Requirement R4.5: Added requirement: RPP architecture MUST include loose coupling for non-breaking version changes.
- * Rewritten R4.6: Replaced old text about server choice on validation strictness with R4.6 (MUST default to ignoring unknown properties, MUST provide mechanism for client to request strict handling).

Data Representation

- * Split Requirement (R5.1, R5.2): Old requirement (MUST use JSON default, MAY support others) split into R5.1 (MUST use JSON default) and R5.2 (MUST be possible to extend RPP for other formats).
- * Rewritten R5.4: Replaced "server MAY support multiple media types" with R5.4 (MUST define default media type, SHALL be extensible for others).
- * Removed Requirement (Old R5.6): Requirement related to server profiles for data models/mappings explicitly removed (linked to Issue #11).
- * Modified R5.8: Changed partial update support from MAY to MUST. Removed specific mention of HTTP PATCH / JSON Merge Patch.
- * New Requirement R5.9: Added requirement: RPP MUST support full update of data objects.
- * New Requirement R5.10: Added requirement: Response with object ID MUST include object URL reference.
- * Removed Requirement: Requirement to use JSContact for contacts moved to C5.1.

Operations and responses

- * New Requirement R6.1: Added requirement: RPP MUST support client requests for different data representation depths (minimal, full, full+dereferenced).
- * New Requirement R6.2: Added requirement: RPP MAY return different representations in different contexts.
- * New Requirement R6.3: Added requirement: Response data MUST only contain object data; transactional info MUST be in HTTP headers.

Discoverability

- * Rewritten R7.2: Significantly expanded the requirement for the discovery document (/.well-known), detailing mandatory structured machine-readable content (services, extensions, versions, etc.).
- * Expanded R7.4, R7.5 & R7.10: Old API version discoverability expanded into R7.4 (MUST support versioning for protocol, objects, representations, etc.), R7.5 (Schema MUST show breaking changes) and &.10 (versions MUST be discoverable).
- * Removed Requirement R7.8: Explicitly removed (linked to Issue #21).
- * New Requirement R7.9: Added requirement: Response with unique object IDs MAY include URL references.

EPP compatibility

- * New Requirement R8.3: Added requirement: RPP-to-EPP mapping definitions MAY be defined in compatibility profiles (references R4.4).
- * Removed Moved: Requirement about including common EPP extensions in core moved (superseded by R4.2).
- * New Requirement R8.4: Added requirement: RPP MUST include an `_extension framework_` for EPP extension equivalents not in core (references R4.2).
- * Rewritten R8.5: Replaced old EPP token requirement with R8.5 (MUST support EPP password-based Authorisation Information per [RFC5731]/[RFC5733]).
- * New Requirement R8.6: Added requirement: RPP SHOULD support `client_id/password` authentication similar to EPP.

Security

- * Rewritten R9.4: Significantly rewrote and expanded the authorisation model requirement (MUST go beyond AuthInfo), detailing potential use cases (transfers without AuthInfo, DNS operator updates via OIDC).
- * New Requirement R9.8: Added requirement: RPP MUST allow multiple user accounts per registrar, MAY delegate user management.
- * New Requirement R9.9: Added requirement: RPP MUST support a granular authorisation matrix (permissions per user).

- * New Requirement R9.10: Added requirement: RPP MUST allow credential updates and enforce password strength/lifetime.

Extensibility

- * Removed Requirement: Removed "SHOULD aim for easy and natural extensibility to richer models".
- * New Requirement R10.3: Added requirement: RPP SHOULD promote standardisation of common extension attributes.
- * Removed Requirement: Removed explicit prohibition of EPP-style command-response extensions.
- * New Requirement R10.5: Added requirement: RPP MUST support extensions defining new status codes.
- * New Requirement R10.6: Added requirement: RPP MUST support extensions adding new HTTP headers.
- * New Requirement R10.7: Added requirement: RPP SHALL have conflict avoidance mechanisms for extensions (private and coordinated).
- * Removed Requirement: Removed requirement for JSON namespace concept.
- * New Requirement R10.9: Added requirement: RPP extensions MUST support versioning, discoverable via discovery document.
- * Removed Requirement R10.10: Requirement for IANA registry of RPP status codes explicitly dropped (linked to Issue #20).
- * New Requirement R10.11: Added requirement: Extension designers MAY add status codes, SHOULD register generic ones with IANA.

Scalability

- * Modified R11.3: Refined load balancing requirement (MUST support at URL level, MUST be possible without body processing).
- * Rewritten R11.5: Expanded async processing clause into R11.5 (MUST support async for multi-object/intensive/manual ops, specifying response mechanism).

Performance

- * Rewritten R12.1: Changed requirement from MUST allow optional body to SHOULD be designed not to include body when not needed (references merge from old R3.4).
- * Modified R12.2: Added constraint: RPP MUST NOT mandate bulk/listing/filtering features where they negatively impact scalability/performance.
- * Removed Requirement R12.3: Requirement allowing compound object creation explicitly removed (linked to Issue #12).

Internationalisation

- * New Requirement R13.1: Added requirement: RPP MUST support internationalisation for core/extension objects and messages.
- * New Requirement R13.2: Added requirement: RPP MUST support human-readable localised response messages. (Moved from old Representation section).

Clients

- * New Requirement R14.1: Added requirement: RPP MUST support server applications as clients.
- * New Requirement R14.2: Added requirement: RPP MUST support CLI/desktop tool interaction.
- * New Requirement R14.3: Added requirement: RPP SHOULD support web browsers (e.g., SPAs) directly.
- * New Requirement R14.4: Added requirement: RPP SHOULD support mobile applications directly.

Requirements for object types

- * New Requirement D13.1 (Domain): Added requirement: RPP MUST support IDNs (UTF-8 and Punycode). (Moved from old Representation section).
- * New Requirement C5.1 (Contact): Added requirement: RPP SHOULD consider using JSContact [RFC9553] for contacts. (Moved from old Data Representation section).
- * New Requirement C13.1 (Contact): Added requirement: RPP MUST support il8n for Contact text fields (name, address, etc.).
- * New Requirement C13.2 (Contact): Added requirement: RPP MUST support internationalised Email addresses [RFC6530].
- * New Requirement C13.3 (Contact): Added requirement: RPP MUST support multiple localised expressions of contact data.

Appendix A. Extensions

- * New Requirement A.1: Added requirement: An extension for a Search API.
- * New Requirement A.2: Added requirement: An extension allowing DNS operators to update DNSSEC key material.

22. Normative References

- [BCP56] Best Current Practice 56,
<<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/bcp56>>.
At the time of writing, this BCP comprises the following:
- Nottingham, M., "Building Protocols with HTTP", BCP 56,
RFC 9205, DOI 10.17487/RFC9205, June 2022,
<<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc9205>>.

- [RAML] raml.org, "RESTful API Modeling Language", 2025,
 <<https://raml.org/>>.
- [REST] Fielding, R., "Architectural Styles and the Design of
 Network-based Software Architectures", 2000,
 <[http://www.ics.uci.edu/~fielding/pubs/dissertation/
rest_arch_style.htm](http://www.ics.uci.edu/~fielding/pubs/dissertation/rest_arch_style.htm)>.
- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate
 Requirement Levels", BCP 14, RFC 2119,
 DOI 10.17487/RFC2119, March 1997,
 <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2119>>.
- [RFC3986] Berners-Lee, T., Fielding, R., and L. Masinter, "Uniform
 Resource Identifier (URI): Generic Syntax", STD 66,
 RFC 3986, DOI 10.17487/RFC3986, January 2005,
 <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3986>>.
- [RFC5730] Hollenbeck, S., "Extensible Provisioning Protocol (EPP)",
 STD 69, RFC 5730, DOI 10.17487/RFC5730, August 2009,
 <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5730>>.
- [RFC5731] Hollenbeck, S., "Extensible Provisioning Protocol (EPP)
 Domain Name Mapping", STD 69, RFC 5731,
 DOI 10.17487/RFC5731, August 2009,
 <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5731>>.
- [RFC5732] Hollenbeck, S., "Extensible Provisioning Protocol (EPP)
 Host Mapping", STD 69, RFC 5732, DOI 10.17487/RFC5732,
 August 2009, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5732>>.
- [RFC5733] Hollenbeck, S., "Extensible Provisioning Protocol (EPP)
 Contact Mapping", STD 69, RFC 5733, DOI 10.17487/RFC5733,
 August 2009, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5733>>.
- [RFC5785] Nottingham, M. and E. Hammer-Lahav, "Defining Well-Known
 Uniform Resource Identifiers (URIs)", RFC 5785,
 DOI 10.17487/RFC5785, April 2010,
 <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5785>>.
- [RFC6530] Klensin, J. and Y. Ko, "Overview and Framework for
 Internationalized Email", RFC 6530, DOI 10.17487/RFC6530,
 February 2012, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6530>>.
- [RFC7807] Nottingham, M. and E. Wilde, "Problem Details for HTTP
 APIs", RFC 7807, DOI 10.17487/RFC7807, March 2016,
 <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7807>>.

- [RFC9110] Fielding, R., Ed., Nottingham, M., Ed., and J. Reschke, Ed., "HTTP Semantics", STD 97, RFC 9110, DOI 10.17487/RFC9110, June 2022, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc9110>>.
- [RFC9553] Stepanek, R. and M. Loffredo, "JSContact: A JSON Representation of Contact Data", RFC 9553, DOI 10.17487/RFC9553, May 2024, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc9553>>.
- [RICHARDSON]
Fowler, M., "Richardson Maturity Model", 2010, <<https://martinfowler.com/articles/richardsonMaturityModel.html>>.
- [ROI] Richardson, L. and S. Ruby, "RESTful Web Services, Chapter 4", 2007, <<https://www.oreilly.com/library/view/restful-web-services/9780596529260/ch04.html>>.

Appendix A. Extensions

A.1 An extension for a Search API to allow for searching for objects in the registry database. Includes advanced search capabilities for object info request.

A.2 An extension that allows a DNS operator to update the DNSSEC key material for a domain object. This extension MAY be used by the DNS operator to update the DNSSEC key material for a domain object, without the need for the registrar to be involved in this process.

A.3 An extension that allows generating a representation of a historical overview for an object, e.g. show all events linked to the object (create, update ...). The historical time window is determined by server policy and is included in the discovery service document.

| TODO: Issue #57 (<https://github.com/ietf-wg-rpp/rpp-requirements/issues/57>)

| TODO: This list is far from being finished

Authors' Addresses

Maarten Wullink
SIDN Labs
Email: maarten.wullink@sidn.nl
URI: <https://sidn.nl/>

Pawel Kowalik
DENIC
Email: pawel.kowalik@denic.de
URI: <https://denic.de/>