

Registration Protocols Extensions (regext)  
Internet-Draft  
Intended status: Standards Track  
Expires: 19 June 2026

G. Brown  
A. Newton  
ICANN  
16 December 2025

Efficient RDAP Referrals  
draft-ietf-regext-rdap-referrals-01

## Abstract

This document describes an RDAP extension that allows RDAP clients to request to be referred to a related RDAP record for a resource.

## 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 19 June 2026.

## Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2025 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 Revised BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the Trust Legal Provisions and are provided without warranty as described in the Revised BSD License.

## Table of Contents

1. Introduction . . . . .	2
2. RDAP Referral Request . . . . .	3
3. RDAP Referral Response . . . . .	3
3.1. Selecting The Appropriate Link . . . . .	4
3.2. Caching by Intermediaries . . . . .	5
4. RDAP Conformance . . . . .	5
5. IANA Considerations . . . . .	5
6. Change Log . . . . .	5
6.1. Changes from 00 to 01 . . . . .	5
6.2. Changes from draft-brown-rdap-referrals-02 to draft-ietf-regext-rdap-referrals-00 . . . . .	5
6.3. Changes from 01 to 02 . . . . .	6
6.4. Changes from 00 to 01 . . . . .	6
7. Normative References . . . . .	6
Authors' Addresses . . . . .	6

## 1. Introduction

Many Registration Data Access Protocol (RDAP, described in [RFC7480], [RFC7481], [RFC9082], [RFC9083] and others) resources contain links to related RDAP resources.

For example, in the domain space, an RDAP record for a domain name received from the registry operator may include a link for the RDAP record for the same object provided by the sponsoring registrar, while in the IP address space, an RDAP record for an address allocation may include links to enclosing or sibling prefixes.

In both cases, RDAP service users are often equally if not more interested in these related RDAP resources than the resource provided by the TLD registry or RIR.

While RDAP supports redirection of RDAP requests using HTTP redirections (which use a 3xx HTTP status and the "Location" header field, see Section 15.4 of [RFC9110]), it is not possible for RDAP servers to know *a priori* whether a client requesting an RDAP record is doing so because it wants to retrieve a related RDAP record, or its own, so it can only respond by providing the full RDAP response. The client must then parse that response in order to extract the relevant URL from the "links" property of the object.

This results in the wasteful expenditure of time, compute resources and bandwidth on the part of both the client and server.

This document describes an extension to RDAP that allows clients to request that an RDAP server refer them to the URL of a related resource.

## 2. RDAP Referral Request

To request a referral to a related resource, the client sends an HTTP GET request to the RDAP server with a path of the form:

```
/referrals0_ref/<relation>/<lookup path>
```

The client replaces <lookup path> with the lookup path of the object being sought and the <relation> with the desired relationship type. For example, a referral query for the domain example.com would be:

```
/referrals0_ref/related/domain/example.com
```

The referral query for the parent network of 192.0.2.42 would have the following full path:

```
/referrals0_ref/rdap-up/ip/192.0.2.42
```

Lookup paths for domain names, IP networks, autonomous system numbers, nameservers, and entities are described in [RFC9082]. Lookups defined by RDAP extensions may also use this extension.

Referral requests for searches, where more than one object is returned, and help queries, as described by [RFC9083], are not supported. Servers MUST return an HTTP 400 for these requests.

## 3. RDAP Referral Response

If the object specified in the request exists, a single appropriate link exists, and the client is authorised to perform the request, the server response MUST have an HTTP status code of 301 or 302, and include an HTTP Location header field, whose value contains the URL of the linked resource.

When an RDAP server holds in its datastore more than one relationship type for an object, a scenario that is possible but not common, only one of the URLs can be returned, as determined by server policy.

The following examples use the HTTP/1.1 message exchange syntax as seen in [RFC9110].

An example of a referral request from a domain registry to a domain registrar:

## Client Request:

```
GET /referrals0_ref/related/domain/example.com HTTP/1.1
Accept: application/rdap+json
```

## Server Response:

```
HTTP/1.1 200 OK
Location: https://registrar.example/domain/example.com
```

An example of a referral request for a parent IPv4 network:

## Client Request:

```
GET /referrals0_ref/rdap-up/ip/192.0.2.42 HTTP/1.1
Accept: application/rdap+json
```

## Server Response:

```
HTTP/1.1 200 OK
Location: https://rir.example/ip/192.0.2.0/24
```

An example of a referral request for a parent IPv6 network:

## Client Request:

```
GET /referrals0_ref/rdap-up/ip/2001%3adb8%3a%3a1 HTTP/1.1
Accept: application/rdap+json"
```

## Server Response:

```
HTTP/1.1 200 OK
Location: https://rir.example/ip/2001%3adb8%3a%3a/32
```

### 3.1. Selecting The Appropriate Link

When the server receives a referral request, it must select which of an object's links it should use to construct the response.

The rel property of the selected link MUST match <relation> path segment of the request. The type and hreflang properties of the link, if present, MUST match the Accept and (if specified) Accept-Language header fields of the request.

### 3.2. Caching by Intermediaries

To facilitate caching of RDAP resources by intermediary proxies, servers which provide a referral based on the value of the Accept header field in the request MUST include a Vary header field (See Section 12.5.5 of [RFC2535]) in the response. This field MUST include accept, and MAY include other header field names.

Example:

Vary: accept, accept-language

### 4. RDAP Conformance

Servers which implement this specification MUST include the string "referrals0" in the "rdapConformance" array in all RDAP responses.

### 5. IANA Considerations

IANA is requested to register the following value in the RDAP Extensions Registry:

\*Extension identifier:\* referrals0

\*Registry operator:\* any.

\*Published specification:\* this document.

\*Contact:\* the authors of this document.

\*Intended usage:\* this extension allows clients to request to be referred to a related resource for an RDAP resource.

### 6. Change Log

This section is to be removed before publishing as an RFC.

#### 6.1. Changes from 00 to 01

- \* Switch to using a path segment and a 30x redirect.
- \* Describe how the server behaves when multiple links exist.

#### 6.2. Changes from draft-brown-rdap-referrals-02 to draft-ietf-regext-rdap-referrals-00

- \* Nothing apart from the name.

### 6.3. Changes from 01 to 02

- \* add this change log.

### 6.4. Changes from 00 to 01

- \* change extension identifier from registrar\_link\_header to referrals0.

## 7. Normative References

- [RFC2535] Eastlake 3rd, D., "Domain Name System Security Extensions", RFC 2535, DOI 10.17487/RFC2535, March 1999, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2535>>.
- [RFC7480] Newton, A., Ellacott, B., and N. Kong, "HTTP Usage in the Registration Data Access Protocol (RDAP)", STD 95, RFC 7480, DOI 10.17487/RFC7480, March 2015, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7480>>.
- [RFC7481] Hollenbeck, S. and N. Kong, "Security Services for the Registration Data Access Protocol (RDAP)", STD 95, RFC 7481, DOI 10.17487/RFC7481, March 2015, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7481>>.
- [RFC9082] Hollenbeck, S. and A. Newton, "Registration Data Access Protocol (RDAP) Query Format", STD 95, RFC 9082, DOI 10.17487/RFC9082, June 2021, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc9082>>.
- [RFC9083] Hollenbeck, S. and A. Newton, "JSON Responses for the Registration Data Access Protocol (RDAP)", STD 95, RFC 9083, DOI 10.17487/RFC9083, June 2021, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc9083>>.
- [RFC9110] Fielding, R., Ed., Nottingham, M., Ed., and J. Reschke, Ed., "HTTP Semantics", STD 97, RFC 9110, DOI 10.17487/RFC9110, June 2022, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc9110>>.

## Authors' Addresses

Gavin Brown  
ICANN  
12025 Waterfront Drive, Suite 300  
Los Angeles, CA 90292  
United States of America  
Email: [gavin.brown@icann.org](mailto:gavin.brown@icann.org)

URI: <https://icann.org>

Andy Newton  
ICANN  
12025 Waterfront Drive, Suite 300  
Los Angeles, CA 90292  
United States of America  
Email: [andy.newton@icann.org](mailto:andy.newton@icann.org)  
URI: <https://icann.org>