Reputation Data Interchange using UDP
draft-kucherawy-reputation-query-udp-00

Abstract

   This document defines a mechanism to conduct queries for reputation
   information using the User Datagram Protocol.

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 http://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 December 3, 2011.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

This memo defines a method to query a reputation data service for
information about an entity, using the User Datagram Protocol. It is
part of a series defining the overall reputation query/response
structure as well as the concept of reputation "vocabularies" for
particular applications.

2. Document Series

This memo represents the media type registration, part of a series of
documents that define the overall service and introduce the initial
exemplary applications. The series is as follows:

1. RFCxxxx: A Model for Reputation Interchange

2. RFCxxxx+1: A Media Type for Reputation Information

3. RFCxxxx+2: Using UDP for Reputation Interchange (this memo)

4. RFCxxxx+3: Using the DNS for Reputation Interchange

5. RFCxxxx+4: Using HTTP/XML for Reputation Interchange

6. RFCxxxx+5: A Reputation Vocabulary for Email Identity Reputation

7. RFCxxxx+6: A Reputation Vocabulary for Email Property Reputation

3. Terminology and Definitions

This section defines terms used in the rest of the document.

3.1. Keywords

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 [KEYWORDS].

3.2. Other Definitions

Other terms of importance in this memo are defined in RFCxxxx, the
base memo in this document series.

4. Description

   [TBD]

5. IANA Considerations

   This memo presents no actions for IANA.

6. Security Considerations

   This memo describes security considerations introduced by the media
   type defined here.

6.1. General

   This memo is part of a series introducing a reputation query and
   response system (see Section 2). The Security Considerations
   sections of the other memos should also be consulted.

7. Informative References

   [KEYWORDS]
             Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate
             Requirement Levels", BCP 14, RFC 2119, March 1997.

Appendix A. Public Discussion

   Public discussion of this suite of memos takes place on the
   domainrep@ietf.org mailing list. See
   https://www.ietf.org/mailman/listinfo/domainrep.

Authors' Addresses

   Nathaniel Borenstein
   Mimecast
   203 Crescent St., Suite 303
   Waltham, MA 02453
   USA

   Phone: +1 781 996 5340
   Email: nsb@guppylake.com

Murray S. Kucherawy
Cloudmark
128 King St., 2nd Floor
San Francisco, CA 94107
USA

Phone: +1 415 946 3800
Email: msk@cloudmark.com