

Individual submission  
Internet-Draft  
Intended status: Standards Track  
Expires: November 4, 2012

D. Crocker  
Brandenburg InternetWorking  
M. Kucherawy  
Cloudmark, Inc.  
May 3, 2012

Indicating Email Handling States in Trace Fields  
draft-ietf-appsawg-received-state-00

## Abstract

This memo registers a trace field clause for use in indicating transitions between handling queues or processing states, including enacting inter- and intra-host message transitions. This might include message quarantining, mailing list moderation, timed delivery, queueing for further analysis, or other similar causes.

## 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 <http://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 November 4, 2012.

## Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2012 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 (<http://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 . . . . .](#) [3](#)
- [2. Keywords . . . . .](#) [3](#)
- [3. New Trace Clause . . . . .](#) [3](#)
- [4. Discussion . . . . .](#) [5](#)
- [5. Granularity . . . . .](#) [6](#)
- [6. IANA Considerations . . . . .](#) [6](#)
  - 6.1. Mail Parameters Additional-registered-clauses  
Sub-Registry . . . . . [6](#)
  - [6.2. Mail Parameters Registered-states Sub-Registry . . . . .](#) [7](#)
- [7. Security Considerations . . . . .](#) [8](#)
- [8. Normative References . . . . .](#) [8](#)
- [Appendix A. Trace Field Examples . . . . .](#) [9](#)
  - [A.1. Typical Delivery Without Obvious Delays . . . . .](#) [9](#)
  - [A.2. Delivery With Moderation . . . . .](#) [10](#)
- [Appendix B. Acknowledgements . . . . .](#) [10](#)

## 1. Introduction

[SMTP] defines the content of email message trace fields, commonly the "Received" field. These are typically used to record an audit trail of the path a message follows from origin to destination, with one such field added each time a message moves from one host to the next.

[Section 3.7.2](#) of that memo mentions that "the most important use of of Received: lines is for debugging mail faults [...]".

There are some cases where there may be large time gaps between trace fields. Though this might be caused by transient communication issues, they might also be caused by policy decisions or special processing regarding the content of the message, authorization of some identity on the message, or transitions between major software components. Common examples include message quarantines (filters that delay relaying or delivery of a message pending manual operator action), pending content analysis, or mailing list servers that impose moderation rules (mailing list owner action required regarding mail from authors not subscribed to those lists).

This memo registers a new optional clause that can be used in trace fields to indicate that a message entered such a special processing queue or state for some period. This allows inspection of the trace information to reveal that the cause for a time gap in trace fields was an imposed delay rather than one caused by transient technical difficulties.

## 2. Keywords

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 [[KEYWORDS](#)].

## 3. New Trace Clause

This memo creates a new trace field clause, called "state", which can be used to indicate the nature of a delay imposed on relaying of a message toward its recipient(s). It is followed by a single keyword that provides that detail. A Mail Transfer Agent (MTA) or other handling agent that determines a message has entered a state other than normal queueing of messages for relaying or delivery MAY generate a trace field including one of these clauses. That is, the presence of this clause on a trace field is an indication of the entry of the message into that state; a later trace field added would indicate its departure from that state.

Appropriate use of this mechanism does not include associating meta-data with the message, such as categorizing the message (e.g., the notions of "is spam" or "was 8-bit, converted to 7-bit").

The following state keywords are defined in this document; extensions may define other registered keywords (see [Section 6.2](#)):

auth: The message entered a queue pending authentication of some identifier in the message.

content: The message entered a queue pending content analysis, such as scanning for spam or viruses.

convert: The message entered a queue pending content conversion for passage through a gateway.

moderation: The message entered a hold pending mailing list moderator action.

normal: The message is not in an administrative hold and is queued for or is being handed off to the next handling agent (which may be local delivery). This is the default interpretation when no "state" clause is present.

other: The message entered a hold or queue for reasons not covered by other keywords in this list, and not for transient technology issues.

outbound: The message entered a queue for outbound relaying. This

is typically the last case added for a single host, and the next Received field is expected to be added by some other host.

quarantine: The message entered a hold in an isolation queue pending operator action for local policy reasons.

timed: The message entered a hold in order to meet a requested delivery window.

The ABNF for this clause:

```
State = CFWS "state" FWS queue-state-keyword *( "/" 1*value )
```

```
queue-state-keyword = ( reg-state-keyword / unreg-state-keyword )
```

```
reg-state-keyword = ( "auth" / "content" / "convert" /  
                      "moderation" / "normal" / "other" /  
                      "quarantine" / "timed" /  
                      additional-state-keyword )
```

```
additional-state-keyword = unstructured  
                          ; see "IANA Considerations" below
```

```
unreg-state-keyword = unstructured  
                    ; from \[MAIL\]
```

"FWS" and "CFWS" are defined in [\[MAIL\]](#); "value" is defined in [\[MIME\]](#).

A transfer agent making use of this extension MAY also include header field comments to provide additional information.

Use of this clause by transfer agents is OPTIONAL.

#### 4. Discussion

Handling agents are not expected to implement or support all of these. Indeed, recording trace information for all of the states described above could make the header of a message inordinately large. Rather, an agent is encouraged to apply state annotations only when a message enters a handling queue where substantial delay is possible, and especially when a handoff has occurred between two different, independent agents.

For example, an MTA receiving a message, doing message authentication, scanning for viruses and spam, and then putting it in an outbound queue could add four Received fields denoting each of these states. However, where they are all done as part of a single system process, in a single pass, doing so would be considered unusual (and extremely verbose). This method SHOULD NOT be applied except when doing detailed analysis of a single component to identify performance issues with those steps.

Rather, an agent that wishes to make a state annotation SHOULD add only a single Received field including such annotation, thus indicating (a) the time of completion of its handling of the message via the date portion of the field, and (b) the final disposition of that message relative to that agent. For example, an MTA receiving a message that performs various checks on the message before immediately handing it off to a Mailing List Manager (MLM) would only

record a "normal" state, assuming it passes those checks. The MLM would then evaluate the message and record its own state once it decides what the next step will be for the handling of that message.

#### 5. Granularity

The degree of granularity -- and therefore the degree of verbosity -- recorded through the use of this additional trace clause will vary according to the needs of the operator making use of this specification. In normal operation, the verbosity would likely be limited to record only "unusual" transitions, such as to a quarantine.

Somewhat greater granularity might also include transitions of administrative responsibility, such as between an Mail Transfer Agent

(MTA) operator and a Mailing List Manager (MLM) operator. This could be further enhanced to note some transitions that are interesting only when other transitions have occurred, such as noting entry to the outbound queue only when the message is originating from an "interesting" source, like an MLM, since an MLM can introduce significant delay and it could be useful to know when it completed its processing, as distinct from the subsequent processing by the originating MTA. In circumstances needing very fine-grained trace information, fields might be created to note all of these "significant" network architecture transitions.

One should note, however, when choosing higher levels of granularity, that the Received fields present on a message could be counted by MTAs when trying to decide whether or not a message routing loop is in effect. A message with an abundance of these might cause an incorrect determination that the message is in a delivery loop, causing it to be removed from the mail stream. See Section 6.3 of [\[SMTP\]](#) for further discussion.

## [6.](#) IANA Considerations

### [6.1.](#) Mail Parameters Additional-registered-clauses Sub-Registry

This memo adds to the "Additional-registered-clauses" sub-registry of the "Mail Parameters" registry, created by [\[SMTP\]](#), the following entry:

Clause name: state

Description: Indicates entry into a special queue state

Syntax Summary: state <state-name>

Reference: [this memo]

### [6.2.](#) Mail Parameters Registered-states Sub-Registry

The "Mail Parameters" registry at IANA is updated by the creation of the "Registered-states" sub-registry to contain valid state keywords

for use with this specification. Updates to this registry are governed by the Specification Required rules of [\[IANA\]](#). Registrations must include the following entries:

Name: The name of the state keyword being defined or updated

Description: A brief description of the keyword's meaning

Specification: The specification document that defines the queue state being registered

Use: One of "current" (the state keyword is in current use), "deprecated" (the state keyword is in use but not recommended for new implementations), or "historic" (the state keyword is no longer in substantial current use).

The initial registration set is as follows:



Name	Description	Specification	Use
auth	Held for message authentication	[this memo]	current
content	Held for message content analysis	[this memo]	current
convert	Held for message content conversion	[this memo]	current
moderation	Held for list moderation	[this memo]	current
normal	Message is not being held other than to accommodate typical relaying delays	[this memo]	current
other	Held for causes not covered by other registered state keywords	[this memo]	current
quarantine	Held for operator action due to content analysis or local policy	[this memo]	current
timed	Held to accommodate a specific requested delivery window	[this memo]	current

## 7. Security Considerations

The use of this trace information can reveal hints as to local policy that was in effect at the time of message handling.

## 8. Normative References

- [IANA] Narten, T. and H. Alvestrand, "Guidelines for Writing an IANA Considerations Section in RFCs", [BCP 26](#), [RFC 5226](#), May 2008.
- [KEYWORDS] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 2119](#), March 1997.
- [MAIL] Resnick, P., "Internet Message Format", [RFC 5322](#), October 2008.

- [MIME] Freed, N. and N. Borenstein, "Multipurpose Internet Mail Extensions (MIME) Part One: Format of Internet Message Bodies", [RFC 2045](#), November 1996.
- [SMTP] Klensin, J., "Simple Mail Transfer Protocol", [RFC 5321](#), October 2008.

## [Appendix A](#). Trace Field Examples

This section includes a sample of the new trace field clause in use.

### [A.1](#). Typical Delivery Without Obvious Delays

Typical message delivery

```
Received: from newyork.example.com
        (newyork.example.com [192.0.2.250])
        by mail-router.example.net (8.11.6/8.11.6)
        with ESMTTP id i7PK0sH7021929
        for <recipient@example.net>;
        Fri, Feb 15 2002 17:19:22 -0800
Received: from internal.example.com
        (internal.example.com [192.168.0.1])
        by newyork.example.com (8.11.6/8.11.6)
        with ESMTTP id i9MKZCRd064134
        for <recipient@example.net>;
        Fri, Feb 15 2002 17:19:08 -0800
```

Example 1: Typical message delivery with no appreciable handling delays; only Received fields shown

## [A.2.](#) Delivery With Moderation

### Message delivery after moderation

```
Received: from newyork.example.com
        (newyork.example.com [192.0.2.250])
        by mail-router.example.net (8.11.6/8.11.6)
        with ESMTTP id i7PK0sH7021929
        for <recipient@example.net>;
        Fri, Feb 15 2002 18:33:29 -0800
Received: from internal.example.com
        (internal.example.com [192.168.0.1])
        by newyork.example.com (8.11.6/8.11.6)
        with ESMTTP id i9MKZCRd064134
        for <secret-list@example.com>
        state moderation (sender not subscribed);
        Fri, Feb 15 2002 17:19:08 -0800
```

Example 2: Message held for moderation; only Received fields shown

The message passed from internal.example.com to newyork.example.com intended for a mailing list hosted at the latter. For list administrative reasons, the message is held there for moderation. It is finally released over an hour later and passed to the next host. A comment after the state expression indicates the actual cause for the administrative hold.

## [Appendix B.](#) Acknowledgements

The authors wish to acknowledge the following for their reviews and constructive criticisms of this proposal: Tony Finch, Carl S. Gutenkunst, John Levine, Bill McQuillan, Alexey Melnikov, Robert A. Rosenberg, Hector Santos, Rolf Sonneveld, and Mykyta Yevstifeyev.

### Authors' Addresses

D. Crocker  
Brandenburg InternetWorking  
675 Spruce Dr.

Sunnyvale 94086  
USA

Phone: +1.408.246.8253  
EMail: dcrocker@bbiw.net  
URI: <http://bbiw.net>

Crocker & Kucherawy

Expires November 4, 2012

[Page 10]

---

Internet-Draft

Email Handling States

May 2012

Murray S. Kucherawy  
Cloudmark, Inc.  
128 King St., 2nd Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94107  
US

Phone: +1 415 946 3800  
EMail: msk@cloudmark.com

