Internet Engineering Task Force                         T. Sattler, Editor
Internet-Draft
Intended status: Best Current Practice
Expires: June 2, 2019                                   December 3, 2018


                    **Registry Unavailable Domain Name Report**
               **draft-sattler-registry-unavailable-domain-report-00**

Abstract

   This document describes the content of an unavailable domain name
   report based on the registry report structure and delivered by the
   registry reporting repository.

Status of This Memo

Copyright Notice

Table of Contents

## 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 domains. 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.

   This document describes the content of an unavailable domain name
   report based on the [I-D.mcpherson-sattler-registry-report-structure]
   and delivered by the [I-D.mcpherson-sattler-registry-reporting-repo].

## 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.  Internationalized Domain Names

   MUST be as defined in
   [I-D.mcpherson-sattler-registry-report-structure].

## 2.2.  Dates and Times

MUST be as defined in
[I-D.mcpherson-sattler-registry-report-structure].

## 2.3.  Character Encoding

MUST be as defined in
[I-D.mcpherson-sattler-registry-report-structure].

## 3.  Report Headings

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

TLD              It MUST contain the top-level domain name and
                 formatted according to section 2.1 of this
                 document.

DOMAIN           It MUST contain the domain name formatted according
                 to section 2.1 of this document.

STATUS           It MUST contain the status of the domain name. It
                 MUST either be 'REGISTRY REGISTERED', 'REGISTERED',
                 'REGISTRY RESERVED' or 'POLICY RESERVED'.

## 4.  Examples

## 4.1.  Single TLD File Example

This is an example of a domain fee report for a single top-level
domain .example with non-standard fees.

Filename: example_unavailable-domains_2018-11-01.csv.gz

```
TLD,DOMAIN,STATUS
example,test1.example,REGISTRY RESERVED
example,test2.example,POLICY RESERVED
example,test3.example,REGISTERED
example,xn--4gqvdy3r.example,REGISTERED
```

## 4.2.  Multiple TLDs File Example

This is an example of a domain fee report for multiple top-level
domains from example registry with non-standard fees.

Filename: example-registry_unavailable-domains_2018-11.csv.gz

```
TLD,DOMAIN,STATUS
example1,test1.example1,REGISTRY RESERVED
example2,test1.example2,POLICY RESERVED
```

```
example3,test2.example3,REGISTERED
xn--zckzah,xn--r8jz45g.xn--zckzah,POLICY RESERVED
```

## 5.  IANA Considerations

This document has no IANA actions.

## 6.  Security Considerations

The registry unavailable domain report described in this document does not provide any security services.

## 7.  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.

## 8.  References

## 8.1.  Normative References

[I-D.mcpherson-sattler-registry-report-structure]
          McPherson, N. and Sattler, T., "Registry Report Strucutre"
          , <https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-mcpherson-
          sattler-registry-report-structure/> (work in
          progress), November 2018

[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>.

## 8.2.  Informative References

   [I-D.mcpherson-sattler-registry-reporting-repo]
              McPherson, N. and Sattler, T., "Registry Reporting
              Repository", <https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-
              mcpherson-sattler-registry-reporting-repo/> (work in
              progress), November 2018

   [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 authors wish to thank the following persons for their feedback
   and suggestions (sorted alphabetically by company):

   o Neal McPherson, 1&1 IONOS
   o James Galvin, Afilias
   o Roger Carney, GoDaddy

Author's Address

   Tobias Sattler

   Email: tobias.sattler@me.com
   URI:   https://tobiassattler.com