

Internet Engineering Task Force  
Internet-Draft  
Intended status: Best Current Practice  
Expires: July 28, 2019

T. Sattler, Editor

January 29, 2019

**Contact Inventory Report**  
**draft-sattler-contact-inventory-report-00**

Abstract

This document describes the content of a Contact Inventory Report based on the Report Structure and delivered by the Reporting Repository.

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 July 28, 2019.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2019 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 Simplified BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the Trust Legal Provisions and are provided without warranty as described in the Simplified BSD License.

Table of Contents

[1.](#) Introduction . . . . . [2](#)

[2.](#) Terminology and Definitions . . . . . [2](#)

[2.1.](#) Dates and Times . . . . . [2](#)

[3.](#) Report Headings . . . . . [3](#)

[4.](#) Unique ID . . . . . [3](#)

[5.](#) Example . . . . . [3](#)

[6.](#) IANA Considerations . . . . . [3](#)

[7.](#) Security Considerations . . . . . [3](#)

[8.](#) Implementation Status . . . . . [4](#)

[9.](#) References . . . . . [4](#)

[9.1.](#) Normative References . . . . . [4](#)

[9.2.](#) Informative References . . . . . [4](#)

[Appendix A.](#) Change History . . . . . [5](#)

[Appendix B.](#) Acknowledgements . . . . . [5](#)

Author's Address . . . . . [5](#)

**[1.](#) Introduction**

Modern top-level domain registries provide a number of detailed reports and documents that their registrars require on a daily, weekly and monthly basis. These most commonly include transaction reports, as well as lists containing currently unavailable domains and current premium domain fees. These reports are critical for registrars' businesses and play an important role in accounting and operations processes as well as in sales and marketing activities. In the current set-up registrars must download these reports from each registry's intranet in a different manner according to each registry's own document management set up.

A contact inventory comparison between the contacts that are on an accreditation / account and the contacts that a registrar / reseller has in its system is therefore useful.

This document describes the content of a Contact Inventory Report based on the [[I-D.mcpherson-sattler-report-structure](#)] and delivered by the [[I-D.mcpherson-sattler-reporting-repository](#)].

**[2.](#) Terminology and Definitions**

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](#)] when specified in their uppercase forms.

**[2.1.](#) Dates and Times**

MUST be as defined in [[I-D.mcpherson-sattler-report-structure](#)].

### 3. Report Headings

The first row MUST be the column headings in the following order:

CONTACTID	It MUST contain the server-unique identifier of of the contact-object.
UPDATED	It MUST contain the date and time of the most recent contact-object modification. If the contact object has never been modified, then the date and time of contact-object creation has to be used. Formatting in both cases according to <a href="#">section 2.1</a> of this document.
INUSE	It MUST either be 0 if the contact-object is not linked to a domain-object or 1 if it is linked.
ID	It MUST contain an unique ID according to <a href="#">section 4</a> of this document.

### 4. Unique ID

A unique ID MUST either be according the IANA registrar IDs (<https://www.iana.org/assignments/registrar-ids/registrar-ids.xhtml>) where applicable or another unique registrar or reseller ID MUST be used.

### 5. Example

This is an example of a contact inventory report.

Filename: contact-inventory\_2019-01-01.csv.gz

```
CONTACTID,UPDATED,INUSE,ID
sh8013,2018-12-30T07:00:00Z,0,1
sh8014,2018-12-30T09:00:15Z,1,1
sh8015,2018-12-31T09:03:22Z,1,1
sh8016,2018-12-31T10:18:56Z,0,1
```

### 6. IANA Considerations

This document has no IANA actions.

### 7. Security Considerations

The contact inventory report described in this document does not provide any security services.

## **8. Implementation Status**

Note to RFC Editor: Please remove this section and the reference to [[RFC7942](#)] before publication.

This section records the status of known implementations of the protocol defined by this specification at the time of posting of this Internet-Draft, and is based on a proposal described in [[RFC7942](#)]. The description of implementations in this section is intended to assist the IETF in its decision processes in progressing drafts to RFCs. Please note that the listing of any individual implementation here does not imply endorsement by the IETF. Furthermore, no effort has been spent to verify the information presented here that was supplied by IETF contributors. This is not intended as, and must not be construed to be, a catalog of available implementations or their features. Readers are advised to note that other implementations may exist.

According to [[RFC7942](#)], "this will allow reviewers and working groups to assign due consideration to documents that have the benefit of running code, which may serve as evidence of valuable experimentation and feedback that have made the implemented protocols more mature. It is up to the individual working groups to use this information as they see fit".

Add implementation details once available.

## **9. References**

### **9.1. Normative References**

- [I-D.mcpherson-sattler-report-structure]  
McPherson, N. and Sattler, T., "Report Structure",  
<<https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-mcpherson-sattler-report-structure/>> (work in progress), January 2019
- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 2119](#), March 1997,  
<<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2119>>.

### **9.2. Informative References**

- [I-D.mcpherson-sattler-reporting-repository]  
McPherson, N. and Sattler, T., "Reporting Repository",  
<<https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-mcpherson-sattler-reporting-repository/>> (work in progress), January 2019
- [RFC7942] Sheffer, Y. and Farrel, A., "Improving Awareness of Running Code: The Implementation Status Section", [RFC 7942](#), July 2016,  
<<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7942>>.

[Appendix A](#). **Change History**

[Appendix B](#). **Acknowledgements**

The author wishes to thank the following persons for their feedback and suggestions (sorted alphabetically by company):

Author's Address

Tobias Sattler

Email: [tobias.sattler@me.com](mailto:tobias.sattler@me.com)

URI: <https://tobiassattler.com>

Sattler

Expires July 28, 2019

[Page 5]