Premium Domain Fee Report
draft-sattler-premium-domain-fee-report-03

Abstract

   This document describes the content of a Premium Domain Fee 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 March 25, 2020.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

   Modern top-level domain registries provide many 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 differently according to each registry's document
   management set up.

   This document describes the content of a Premium Domain Fee 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. Internationalized Domain Names

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

2.2. Dates and Times

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

2.3. Character Encoding

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

2.4. Currency

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:

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',
                 'AVAILABLE', 'REGISTRY RESERVED' or 'POLICY
                 RESERVED'.

DESCRIPTION   It MUST contain the descriptive name of the premium
                 tier to which the domain is allocated.

CURRENCY   It MUST contain the currency of the following fees
                 according to section 2.4 of this document.

CREATE   It MUST contain the fee for a domain create.

RENEW   It MUST contain the fee for a domain renew.

TRANSFER   It MUST contain the fee for a domain transfer.

RESTORE   It MUST contain the fee for a domain restore.

EFFECTIVE DATE   It MUST contain the date and time the fee listed
                 will go into effect and formatted according to
                 section 2.2 of this document.

[4](). Fees

Fees MUST either be whole numbers or rounded to two decimal places.
The dividing point is a period (.).

[5](). Examples

[5.1](). 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_premium-domains_2018-11-01.csv.gz

```
TLD,DOMAIN,STATUS,DESCRIPTION,CURRENCY,CREATE,RENEW,TRANSFER,RESTORE,
EFFECTIVE DATE
example,test1.example,REGISTRY RESERVED,A,USD,200,200,200,40,
2018-11-08T00:00:00Z
example,test2.example,POLICY RESERVED,DD,USD,75.50,75.50,75.50,40,
2018-11-08T00:00:00Z
example,test3.example,AVAILABLE,B,USD,10000,10000,10000,40,
2018-12-01T00:00:00Z
example,xn--4gqvdy3r.example,AVAILABLE,A,USD,50,50,50,40,
2018-12-01T06:00:00Z
```

[5.2](). 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_premium-domains_2018-11.csv.gz

```
TLD,DOMAIN,STATUS,DESCRIPTION,CURRENCY,CREATE,RENEW,TRANSFER,RESTORE,
EFFECTIVE DATE
example1,test1.example1,REGISTRY RESERVED,A,USD,200,200,200,40,
2018-11-08T00:00:00Z
example2,test1.example2,POLICY RESERVED,DD,USD,75.50,75.50,75.50,40,
2018-11-08T00:00:00Z
example3,test2.example3,AVAILABLE,B,USD,10000,10000,10000,40,
2018-12-01T00:00:00Z
xn--zckzah,xn--r8jz45g.xn--zckzah,AVAILABLE,A,USD,50,50,50,40,
2018-12-01T06:00:00Z
```

5.3. Fee Change File Example

   If the fee for a domain name is changing or moving to reserved or
   unreserved in the future, there MUST be two entries for the domain.

   One entry for the current fee and status of the name, this entry MUST
   be removed once the change takes place, and one entry for the future
   price of the domain name with its effective date.

   Example of a file that contains a future fee change for a single top-
   level domain .example.

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

   TLD,DOMAIN,STATUS,DESCRIPTION,CURRENCY,CREATE,RENEW,TRANSFER,RESTORE,
   EFFECTIVE DATE
   example,test1.example,REGISTRY RESERVED,A,USD,200,200,200,40,
   2018-11-01T00:00:00Z
   example,test1.example,REGISTRY RESERVED,DD,USD,75.50,75.50,75.50,40,
   2018-12-01T00:00:00Z

6. IANA Considerations

   This document has no IANA actions.

7. Security Considerations

   The Premium Domain Fee 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 Strucutre",
          <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

A.1. Change from 00 to 01

   Fixed minor typos. Clarified example file name in section 5.3.

A.2. Change from 01 to 02

   Clarified the Period. Fixed numerous typos.

A.3. Change from 02 to PREMIUMFEE 00

   Changed draft name. Added Roger Carney as additional author.

A.4. Change from PREMIUMFEE 00 to PREMIUMFEE 01

   Editorial changes.

A.5. Change from PREMIUMFEE 01 to PREMIUMFEE 02

   Editorial changes.

A.6. Change from PREMIUMFEE 02 to PREMIUMFEE 03

   Editorial changes.

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 Jody Kolker, GoDaddy

Authors' Addresses

   Tobias Sattler

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

   Roger Carney
   GoDaddy Inc.
   14455 N. Hayden Rd. #219
   Scottsdale, AZ 85260
   US

   Email: rcarney@godaddy.com
   URI: http://www.godaddy.com