IMAP Extensions Working Group/MORG
BOF
Internet-Draft
Intended status: Standards Track
Expires: December 12, 2008

A. Melnikov
Isode Limited
T. Sirainen

June 10, 2008

IMAP4 Extension for returning STATUS information in extended LIST draft-melnikov-imapext-status-in-list-00

Status of this Memo

By submitting this Internet-Draft, each author represents that any applicable patent or other IPR claims of which he or she is aware have been or will be disclosed, and any of which he or she becomes aware will be disclosed, in accordance with Section 6 of BCP 79.

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF), its areas, and its working groups. Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts.

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."

The list of current Internet-Drafts can be accessed at http://www.ietf.org/ietf/1id-abstracts.txt.

The list of Internet-Draft Shadow Directories can be accessed at http://www.ietf.org/shadow.html.

This Internet-Draft will expire on December 12, 2008.

Abstract

Many IMAP clients display information about total number of messages/ total number of unseen messages in IMAP mailboxes. In order to do that they are forced to issue a LIST or LSUB command, to list all available mailboxes, followed by a STATUS command for each mailbox found. This document provides an extension to LIST command that allows the client to request STATUS information for mailboxes together with other information typically returned by the LIST command.

Note

A revised version of this draft document will be submitted to the RFC editor as a Proposed Standard for the Internet Community. Discussion and suggestions for improvement are requested, and should be sent to morg@ietf.org.

Table of Contents

1. Conventions used in this document 3

2. STATUS return option to LIST command 3

3. Examples 3

4. Formal Syntax 4

5. Security Considerations 4

6. IANA Considerations 4

7. Acknowledgements 5

8. Normative References 5

Authors' Addresses 6
Intellectual Property and Copyright Statements 7

1. Conventions used in this document

In examples, "C:" indicates lines sent by a client that is connected to a server. "S:" indicates lines sent by the server to the client.

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 RFC 2119 [Kwds].

2. STATUS return option to LIST command

[RFC3501] explicitly disallows mailbox patterns in the STATUS command. The main reason was to discourage frequent use of the STATUS command by clients, as it might be quite expensive for an IMAP server to perform. However this prohibition had resulted in an opposite effect: a new generation of IMAP clients appeared, that issues STATUS command for each mailbox returned by the LIST command. This behaviour is suboptimal to say at least: it wastes extra bandwidth and, in the case of a client that doesn't support IMAP pipelining, also degrades performance by using too many round trips. This document tries to remedy the situation by specifying a single command that can be used by the client to request all the necessary information. In order to achieve this goal this document is extending the LIST command command with a new return option: STATUS. This option takes STATUS data items as parameters. For each selectable mailbox matching the list pattern and selection options, the server MUST return an untagged LIST response followed by an untagged STATUS response containing the information requested in the STATUS return option.

If an attempted STATUS for a listed mailbox fails because the mailbox can't be selected (e.g. if the "l" ACL right [ACL] is granted to the mailbox and the "r" right is not granted, or due to a race condition between LIST and STATUS changing the mailbox to \NoSelect), the STATUS response MUST NOT be returned and the LIST response MUST include the \NoSelect attribute. This means the server may have to buffer the LIST reply until it has successfully looked up the necessary STATUS information.

3. Examples

```
C: A01 LIST "" % RETURN (STATUS (MESSAGES UNSEEN))
S: * LIST () "."  "INBOX"
S: * STATUS "INBOX" (MESSAGES 17 UNSEEN 16)
S: * LIST () "." "foo"
S: * STATUS "foo" (MESSAGES 30 UNSEEN 29)
```

```
S: * LIST (\NoSelect) "." "bar"
S: A01 OK List completed.
```

"bar" mailbox isn't selectable, so it has no STATUS reply.

```
C: A02 LIST (SUBSCRIBED RECURSIVEMATCH)"" % RETURN (STATUS
(MESSAGES))
S: * LIST (\Subscribed) "."  "INBOX"
S: * STATUS "INBOX" (MESSAGES 17)
S: * LIST () "." "foo" (CHILDINFO ("SUBSCRIBED"))
S: A02 OK List completed.
```

LIST reply for "foo" is returned because it has matching children, but no STATUS reply is returned because "foo" itself doesn't match the selection criteria.

4. Formal Syntax

The following syntax specification uses the augmented Backus-Naur Form (BNF) as described in [ABNF]. Terms not defined here are taken from [RFC3501], [LISTEXT].

```
    return-option =/ status-option

    status-option = "STATUS" SP "(" status-att *(SP status-att) ")"
                    ;; This ABNF production complies with
                    ;; <option-extension> syntax.
```

5. Security Considerations

[[anchor4: TBD]]

6. IANA Considerations

IMAP4 capabilities are registered by publishing a standards track or IESG approved experimental RFC. The registry is currently located at:

http://www.iana.org/assignments/imap4-capabilities

This document defines the X-DRAFT-I00-LIST-STATUS [[anchor5: Note to RFC Editor: fix before publication]] IMAP capability. IANA is requested to add it to the registry.

IANA is also requested to add the following new LIST-EXTENDED option to the IANA registry established by [LISTEXT]:

To: iana@iana.org
Subject: Registration of LIST-EXTENDED option STATUS

LIST-EXTENDED option name: STATUS

LIST-EXTENDED option type: RETURN

LIST-EXTENDED option description: Causes the LIST command to return STATUS responses in addition to LIST responses.

Published specification : XXXX.

Security considerations: XXXX.

Intended usage: COMMON

Person and email address to contact for further information: Alexey Melnikov <Alexey.Melnikov@isode.com>

Owner/Change controller: iesg@ietf.org

7. Acknowledgements

TBD.

8. Normative References

[ABNF] Crocker, D., Ed. and P. Overell, "Augmented BNF for Syntax Specifications: ABNF", RFC 5234, January 2008.

[ACL] Melnikov, A., "IMAP4 Access Control List (ACL) Extension", RFC 4314.

[Kwds] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", RFC 2119, March 1997.

[LISTEXT] Leiba, B. and A. Melnikov, "IMAP4 LIST Command Extensions", RFC 5258, 2008.

[RFC3501] Crispin, M., "INTERNET MESSAGE ACCESS PROTOCOL - VERSION 4rev1", RFC 3501, March 2003.

Authors' Addresses

Alexey Melnikov
Isode Limited
5 Castle Business Village
36 Station Road
Hampton, Middlesex TW12 2BX
UK

Email: Alexey.Melnikov@isode.com
URI: http://www.melnikov.ca/

Timo Sirainen

Email: tss@iki.fi

Full Copyright Statement

Copyright (C) The IETF Trust (2008).

This document is subject to the rights, licenses and restrictions contained in BCP 78, and except as set forth therein, the authors retain all their rights.

This document and the information contained herein are provided on an "AS IS" basis and THE CONTRIBUTOR, THE ORGANIZATION HE/SHE REPRESENTS OR IS SPONSORED BY (IF ANY), THE INTERNET SOCIETY, THE IETF TRUST AND THE INTERNET ENGINEERING TASK FORCE DISCLAIM ALL WARRANTIES, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO ANY WARRANTY THAT THE USE OF THE INFORMATION HEREIN WILL NOT INFRINGE ANY RIGHTS OR ANY IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE.

Intellectual Property

The IETF takes no position regarding the validity or scope of any Intellectual Property Rights or other rights that might be claimed to pertain to the implementation or use of the technology described in this document or the extent to which any license under such rights might or might not be available; nor does it represent that it has made any independent effort to identify any such rights. Information on the procedures with respect to rights in RFC documents can be found in BCP 78 and BCP 79.

Copies of IPR disclosures made to the IETF Secretariat and any assurances of licenses to be made available, or the result of an attempt made to obtain a general license or permission for the use of such proprietary rights by implementers or users of this specification can be obtained from the IETF on-line IPR repository at http://www.ietf.org/ipr.

The IETF invites any interested party to bring to its attention any copyrights, patents or patent applications, or other proprietary rights that may cover technology that may be required to implement this standard. Please address the information to the IETF at ietf-ipr@ietf.org.