

Internet Engineering Task Force
Internet-Draft
Intended status: Best Current Practice
Expires: June 2, 2019

T. Sattler, Editor

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

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 June 2, 2019.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2018 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.	Internationalized Domain Names	2
2.2.	Dates and Times	3
2.3.	Character Encoding	3
3.	Report Headings	3
4.	Examples	3
4.1.	Single TLD File Example	3
4.2.	Multiple TLDs File Example	3
5.	IANA Considerations	4
6.	Security Considerations	4
7.	Implementation Status	4
8.	References	4
8.1.	Normative References	4
8.2.	Informative References	5
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 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

Sattler

Expires June 2, 2019

[Page 3]

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](https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7942), 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, Afiliias
- o Roger Carney, GoDaddy

Author's Address

Tobias Sattler

Email: tobias.sattler@me.com

URI: <https://tobiassattler.com>

Sattler

Expires June 2, 2019

[Page 5]