EMAILCORE BOF Madrid 2020

Chairs:
Alexey Melnikov <alexey.melnikov@isode.com>
Seth Blank <seth@valimail.com>

Administrivia

- This Meetecho session is being recorded

- Meetecho:

  - https://meetings.conf.meetecho.com/ietf108/?group=emailcore&short=&item=1

- Jabber room (discussions/back channel):

  - emailcore@jabber.ietf.org

- Shared note taking:

  - https://codimd.ietf.org/notes-ietf-108-emailcore

Note Well

- This is a reminder of IETF policies in effect on various topics such as patents or code of conduct. It is only meant to point you in the right direction. Exceptions may apply. The IETF's patent policy and the definition of an IETF "contribution" and "participation" are set forth in BCP 79; please read it carefully.

- As a reminder:

  - By participating in the IETF, you agree to follow IETF processes and policies.

  - If you are aware that any IETF contribution is covered by patents or patent applications that are owned or controlled by you or your sponsor, you must disclose that fact, or not participate in the discussion.

  - As a participant in or attendee to any IETF activity you acknowledge that written, audio, video, and photographic records of meetings may be made public.

  - Personal information that you provide to IETF will be handled in accordance with the IETF Privacy Statement.

  - As a participant or attendee, you agree to work respectfully with other participants; please contact the ombudsteam (https://www.ietf.org/contact/ombudsteam/) if you have questions or concerns about this.

Note Well
(continued)

- Definitive information is in the documents listed below and other IETF BCPs. For advice, please talk to WG chairs or ADs:

  - BCP 9 (Internet Standards Process)

  - BCP 25 (Working Group processes)

  - BCP 25 (Anti-Harassment Procedures)

  - BCP 54 (Code of Conduct)

  - BCP 78 (Copyright)

  - BCP 79 (Patents, Participation)

  - https://www.ietf.org/privacy-policy/ (Privacy Policy)

Agenda

- Agenda bashing, administrivia, note well (chairs) - **5 mins**

- Problem statement (chairs) - **5 mins**

- Review of proposed changes to "Internet Message Format" (RFC 5322) draft-resnick-rfc5322bis - **15 mins**

- Triage of selected issues for "Simple Mail Transfer Protocol" (RFC 5321) draft-klensin-rfc5321bis - **10 mins**

    - G.9. Revisiting Quoted Strings

    - G.7.11. Bring back 1yz reply codes?

- Core Email Applicability Statement - **35 mins**

    - Suggested SMTP Extensions

    - Terminology

    - IP Address Literals in EHLO, MAIL or RCPT

    - Resolvable FQDNs and private domain names

- Proposed Charter scope - **25 mins**

- Charter Review - **5 mins**

Problem Statement

- Email is widely used

- RFC 821 (SMTP) and RFC 822 (Email Format) are **Internet Standards**

- Community revised them once to become RFC 2821 and RFC 2822 - **Proposed Standards**

- Community revised them again: RFC 5321 and RFC 5322 are **Draft Standards**

  - This level doesn't exist anymore

  - Let's revise them to be **Internet Standards** to reflect current use

  - *Sounds easy ;-)?*

Restricting Scope

- No major surgeries/rewrites to documents

- Move RFC 5321/5322 to Internet Standard.

  - We can take some stuff out completely...

  - ... or move to the Applicability Statement/BCP(*) document

- Chairs are not proposing to include EAI or MIME

  - EAI deployment is not quite at the same level of maturity

  - Revising MIME would be great, but let's deal with RFC 5321/5322 first

Proposal for this session

- We review/triage submitted errata and other known issues on RFC 5321/5322

    - 3 documents: rfc5321bis, rfc5322bis, Core Email Applicability Statement/BCP

    - We don't have time to triage all raised issues, we will continue on **the mailing list** after the meeting

- We can see if there is rough consensus for what kind of changed to do and not to do

- Review proposed Charter in light of this discussion

    - We start at the end of this session and will continue on the mailing list, if needed

RFC 5322
(Internet Message Format)

- Some errata already address by Pete in his draft

  - See the change list in the draft

- 3 remaining errata need discussion:

  - **Header field name length limit**

    - https://www.rfc-editor.org/errata/eid5918

  - **Disallow empty quoted string**

    - https://www.rfc-editor.org/errata/eid3135

  - **Issue with ABNF for "field"**

    - https://www.rfc-editor.org/errata/eid2950

RFC 5321
(Simple Mail Transfer Protocol)

- G.9. Revisiting Quoted Strings

  - Example: Username '**A1234 B5678**' (note the space)

  - "A1234 B5678"@<u>example.com</u> or

  - "A1234**** B5678"@<u>example.com</u> ?

  - What about mailto: URIs?

    - "A1234**\%20**B5678"@<u>example.com</u>

RFC 5321
(Simple Mail Transfer Protocol)

- G.7.11. Bring back 1yz reply codes?

Suggested scope for the "Core Email Applicability Statement"

- Best practices on use of SMTP, email format/MIME.

- Don't touch POP/IMAP/JMAP or Sieve

  - They IMAP/Sieve and JMAP have their own WGs (EXTRA and JMAP respectively)

- Don't touch SMTP Submission (RFC 6409) this time around

- Reference DMARC/DKIM/SPF?

  - Note that DMARC has its own WG, so not doing any work here

rfc5321bis versa Core Email Applicability Statement draft

- What follows on the next slides is a **strawman from chairs**

- If you disagree whether a particular issue belongs to the A/S and not to rfc5321bis, it is Ok :-). Please tell chairs when we discuss a particular issue.

Core Email Applicability Statement

- Suggested SMTP Extensions (MUST/SHOULD/ mention/don't mention):

  - 8BITMIME (RFC 6152)

  - PIPELINING (RFC 2920)

  - G.8. Enhanced Reply Codes (RFC 5248) and DSNs (RFC 3461)

  - SMTPUTF8 (a.k.a. EAI) (RFC 6531)

Core Email Applicability Statement

- Terminology:

  - G.3. Meaning of "MTA" and Related Terminology

  - G.7.2. SMTP Model, terminology, and relationship to RFC 5598

  - G.11. SMTP Clients, Servers, Senders, and Receivers

Core Email Applicability Statement

- G.1. IP Address Literals in EHLO, MAIL or RCPT

Core Email Applicability Statement

- G.7.3. Resolvable FQDNs and private domain names

  - Several related issues in Section 2.3.5 ("Domain Names")

  - **Only resolvable, fully-qualified domain names (FQDNs) are permitted when domain names are used in SMTP.**

    - Editor's Note: does "in the public DNS" or equivalent need to be added to "resolvable"???

    - Editor's Note: More generally, does this section need work to clarify the relationship to private domain names?

Before we look at the Proposed Charter text...

- Reminder that the proposal is "no major surgeries to RFC 5321/5322"

- But text can be either

  - moved from them to the Applicability Statement/BCP

  - or deleted altogether

  - or added to 5321bis/5322bis, as long as it is a clarification

  - or added to the A/S based on modern documented and deployed email practices

Proposed Charter Review (1 of 4)

- The base documents defining Internet messaging — colloquially, email -- are RFC 5321 (protocol) and RFC 5322 (format). These are revisions and consolidations of prior documents and were last published in 2008. They currently sit at Draft Standard status, a status that actually no longer exists according to current IETF procedure.

- Since then some errata have accumulated (both submitted to IETF and reported directly to editors), as well as comments made about these documents not necessarily describing best email practices. There is now sufficient critical mass to undertake a limited review and revision of these documents for the purpose of advancing them to Internet Standard status.

Proposed Charter Review (2 of 4)

- This working group will conduct a limited review and revision to the base email specifications, and will publish new versions of these documents at Internet Standard status, per **RFC 6410**. The **limited review is restricted** to **corrections and clarifications** only. In addition to processing **existing, verified errata** and **errata marked as "held for document update"**, the WG may address newly-offered errata. However, **no new protocol extensions or amendments will be considered for inclusion** into 5321bis and 5322bis documents, **unless** they are already published as **standards track RFC**s.

Proposed Charter Review (3 of 4)

- The working group will also work on Applicability Statement/BCP in parallel with 5321bis and 5322bis, to capture relationships to other **documented and widely deployed** work (for example **recommended extensions**) and **current email practices**.

Proposed Charter Review (4 of 4)

- Upon completion of these three milestones, and assuming the participants still have the momentum to do so, the working group may undertake similar review and revision of other email specifications. Such future work will require rechartering.

Further discussions

- For work outside of proposed Charter, e.g. enhancements to SMTP, use ietf-smtp@ietf.org

- Should we create a separate mailing list for EMAILCORE?