

YAM Working Group
Internet-Draft
Intended status: Informational
Expires: November 23, 2010

P. Resnick
Qualcomm Incorporated
May 22, 2010

Preliminary Evaluation of [RFC 5322](#) "Internet Message Format", for advancement from Draft Standard to Full Standard by the YAM Working Group
[draft-ietf-yam-rfc5322bis-msgfmt-pre-evaluation-00](#)

Abstract

This memo is a preliminary evaluation of [RFC 5322](#) "Internet Message Format" for advancement from Draft to Full Standard. It has been prepared by the The Yet Another Mail Working Group.

THIS INTERNET DRAFT IS NOT MEANT TO BE PUBLISHED AS AN RFC, BUT IS WRITTEN TO FACILITATE PROCESSING WITHIN THE IESG.

Status of This Memo

This Internet-Draft is submitted to IETF 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 23, 2010.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2010 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

Internet-Draft

YAM 5322bis Evaluation

May 2010

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
1.1.	Note to RFC Editor	3
2.	Preliminary Evaluation	3
2.1.	Document	3
2.2.	Time in Place	3
2.3.	Implementation and Operational Experience	3
2.4.	Proposed Changes	4
2.5.	Non-Changes	4
2.6.	Downward references	4
2.7.	IESG Feedback	4
3.	IANA Considerations	5
4.	Security Considerations	5
5.	References	5
5.1.	Normative References	5
5.2.	Informative References	6

Internet-Draft

YAM 5322bis Evaluation

May 2010

1. Introduction

A preliminary evaluation has been made of "Internet Message Format" [[RFC5322](#)] by the Yet Another Mail (YAM) Working Group for advancing it from Draft to Full Standard. The YAM WG requests feedback from the IESG on this decision.

1.1. Note to RFC Editor

This Internet-Draft is not meant to be published as an RFC. It is written to facilitate processing within the IESG.

2. Preliminary Evaluation

2.1. Document

Title: Internet Message Format

Link: <http://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc5322>

2.2. Time in Place

[RFC2026](#): _"A specification shall remain at the Draft Standard level for at least four (4) months, or until at least one IETF meeting has occurred."_

Published: October 2008

2.3. Implementation and Operational Experience

[RFC2026](#): _"significant implementation and successful operational experience ... characterized by a high degree of technical maturity and by a generally held belief that the specified protocol or service provides significant benefit to the Internet community."_

Confidence level: Very high.

[RFC5322] moved [[RFC2822](#)] from Proposed to Draft Standard, which itself was an update of [[RFC0822](#)] done by the DRUMS WG. Both [[RFC5322](#)] and [[RFC2822](#)] brought the protocol specifications into line with actual implementations and operational experience in electronic mail over the past 28 years. In that sense, the implementation and operational experience with these documents has been extensive.

Resnick

Expires November 23, 2010

[Page 3]

Internet-Draft

YAM 5322bis Evaluation

May 2010

[2.4.](#) Proposed Changes

The YAM WG proposes making the following changes in a revision:

Errata 1766: A simple clarifying editorial change, will be fixed.

Errata 1906: A request to simplify the ABNF of the obsolete (i.e., backward compatability) syntax of the body of a message, will be examined to see if the syntax can be simplified, though the suggested syntax provided by the errata reporter is not correct as stated.

Errata 1908: An error in the ABNF of the obsolete (i.e., backward compatability) syntax of "folding white space" that does not agree with the description in the document or the current practice, will be fixed.

Errata 2104: An error in the ABNF of the obsolete (i.e., backward compatability) syntax of "unstructured" text that does not agree with the description in the document or the current practice, will be fixed.

[2.5.](#) Non-Changes

The YAM WG discussed and chose not to make the following changes:

1. The Security Considerations section was extensively reviewed in 2008 (during the review and approval of [RFC 5322](#)). No evidence has appeared since then that would require further review or

additional changes.

[2.6.](#) Downward references

At Full Standard, the following references would be downward references:

None.

[2.7.](#) IESG Feedback

The YAM WG requests feedback from the IESG on this decision. In particular:

- o Does the IESG believe the proposed changes are suitable during a move from Draft to Full Standard?
- o Excluding the previous proposed changes and expected IESG support for technically substantive IETF last call feedback, does the IESG

Resnick

Expires November 23, 2010

[Page 4]

Internet-Draft

YAM 5322bis Evaluation

May 2010

believe any additional changes are critical to advance this document from draft to full standard? If so, please provide sufficient information so the WG can address these issues prior to IETF last call or determine that the document is inappropriate for the YAM WG to process at this time.

- o Does the IESG consider the downward references acceptable for a full standard? If not, please cite which specific downward reference or references are problematic and why so the WG can address these issues prior to IETF last call or determine the document is inappropriate for the YAM WG to process at this time.

[3.](#) IANA Considerations

This document contains no IANA actions.

[4.](#) Security Considerations

This document requests IESG feedback and does not raise any security concerns. Security considerations for RFC 5322 [[RFC5322](#)] have been taken into account during the preliminary evaluation and appear in either [Section 2.4](#) or [Section 2.5](#) of this document.

[5.](#) References

[5.1.](#) Normative References

- [ANSI.X3-4.1986] American National Standards Institute, "Coded Character Set - 7-bit American Standard Code for Information Interchange", ANSI X3.4, 1986.
- [RFC1034] Mockapetris, P., "Domain names - concepts and facilities", STD 13, [RFC 1034](#), November 1987.
- [RFC1035] Mockapetris, P., "Domain names - implementation and specification", STD 13, [RFC 1035](#), November 1987.
- [RFC1123] Braden, R., "Requirements for Internet Hosts - Application and Support", STD 3, [RFC 1123](#), October 1989.
- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 2119](#), March 1997.
- [RFC5234] Crocker, D. and P. Overell, "Augmented BNF for Syntax Specifications: ABNF", STD 68, [RFC 5234](#), January 2008.

Resnick

Expires November 23, 2010

[Page 5]

Internet-Draft

YAM 5322bis Evaluation

May 2010

[5.2.](#) Informative References

- [RFC0822] Crocker, D., "Standard for the format of ARPA Internet text messages", STD 11, [RFC 822](#), August 1982.
- [RFC1305] Mills, D., "Network Time Protocol (Version 3) Specification, Implementation", [RFC 1305](#), March 1992.
- [ISO.2022.1994] International Organization for Standardization, "Information technology - Character code structure and extension techniques", ISO Standard 2022, 1994.
- [RFC2045] Freed, N. and N. Borenstein, "Multipurpose Internet

Mail Extensions (MIME) Part One: Format of Internet Message Bodies", [RFC 2045](#), November 1996.

[RFC2046] Freed, N. and N. Borenstein, "Multipurpose Internet Mail Extensions (MIME) Part Two: Media Types", [RFC 2046](#), November 1996.

[RFC2047] Moore, K., "MIME (Multipurpose Internet Mail Extensions) Part Three: Message Header Extensions for Non-ASCII Text", [RFC 2047](#), November 1996.

[RFC2049] Freed, N. and N. Borenstein, "Multipurpose Internet Mail Extensions (MIME) Part Five: Conformance Criteria and Examples", [RFC 2049](#), November 1996.

[RFC2822] Resnick, P., "Internet Message Format", [RFC 2822](#), April 2001.

[RFC3864] Klyne, G., Nottingham, M., and J. Mogul, "Registration Procedures for Message Header Fields", [BCP 90](#), [RFC 3864](#), September 2004.

[RFC4021] Klyne, G. and J. Palme, "Registration of Mail and MIME Header Fields", [RFC 4021](#), March 2005.

[RFC4288] Freed, N. and J. Klensin, "Media Type Specifications and Registration Procedures", [BCP 13](#), [RFC 4288](#), December 2005.

[RFC4289] Freed, N. and J. Klensin, "Multipurpose Internet Mail Extensions (MIME) Part Four: Registration Procedures", [BCP 13](#), [RFC 4289](#), December 2005.

Resnick

Expires November 23, 2010

[Page 6]

Internet-Draft

YAM 5322bis Evaluation

May 2010

[RFC5321] Klensin, J., "Simple Mail Transfer Protocol", [RFC 5321](#), October 2008.

[RFC5322] Resnick, P., Ed., "Internet Message Format", [RFC 5322](#), October 2008.

Author's Address

Pete Resnick
Qualcomm Incorporated
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, CA 92121-1714
US

Phone: +1 858 651 4478
EMail: presnick@qualcomm.com
URI: <http://www.qualcomm.com/~presnick/>