EXTRA

IETF 110 / 12 Mar 2021
Prague / Virtual
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.

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

• Intro and Note Well: 5 min
• Current documents:
  - draft-ietf-extra-imap4rev2 - 15 min
  - draft-ietf-extra-quota - 10 min
  - draft-ietf-extra-sieve-mailboxid - 5 min
  - draft-ietf-extra-sieve-snooze - 10 min
• Milestone review: 5 min
• Future of the working group / AOB - 10 min
imap4rev2

- See Alexey’s Slides
quota

• See Alexey’s Slides
Sieve-mailbox (1/3)

• Only open issue is inclusion of ABNF
  – Removed in -07 based on reviews
  – But maybe should be added back?
  – I’m leaning towards “there’s no point”, based on ...
Review of other sieve specs:

- Has Grammar (sometimes partial):
  - RFC8580, RFC6134, RFC6009, RFC5435, ...

- No Grammar at all:
  - RFC8579, RFC7352, RFC6785, RFC6609, RFC6558, RFC6468, RFC6133, RFC6132, RFC6131, RFC5703, RFC5490, RFC5463, RFC5437, RFC5436, RFC5429, ...
Anyway, here's what was removed...

8. Formal Syntax

```
test =/ "mailboxidexists" string-list

tag =/ "::mailboxid" string

FCC =/ ["::mailboxid" <mailboxid: string>]
    ; if [@RFC8580] is supported
```
sieve-snooze

• See Ken’s Slides
• Are we ready to WGLC?
Milestone Review
Other business

• Do we have anything that people want to work on after these 4 documents clear?
  – 1 related draft, “sieve-eai”, expired Mar 2020
  – We had an offer of a “sieve actions registry” document