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Background

• MESSAGELIMIT was split off (from PARTIAL) into a separate WG draft

• MESSAGELIMIT limits the number of messages that can be operated upon in a single FETCH/SEARCH/STORE/COPY/MOVE/EXPUNGE/APPEND

• Can be implemented separately from the IMAP PARTIAL extension, but there are some interactions. The document has examples of using just the MESSAGELIMIT and both together.
Changes since -01

- Removed ENABLE MESSAGELIMIT, as this is something that the server would enforce regardless of client wishes.
  - Before this extension the server would just enforce it without telling the client
- COPY/UID COPY now fail unconditionally when the limit is exceeded
  - This is to preserve IMAP4rev2/rev1 atomicity guarantee
  - MOVE/UID MOVE is not affected by this
- Clarified interaction with SEARCHRES
  - The value stored in $ is truncated
- Clarified that this also affects EXPUNGE/UID EXPUNGE and APPEND (when MULTIAPPEND is also supported)
- Added (and fixed) UIDAFTER and UIDBEFORE SEARCH criteria
Open Issues

• Separate capability if the server only wants to enforce limit on COPY/APPEND? (Timo)

• Why not?
Open Issues

• LIMIT response code versa MESSAGELIMIT response code? (Phillip Tao)

• LIMIT is defined more generally. Example given is about IMAP keyword limit.

• LIMIT has no parameters defined

  • Would defining extra parameters (as in MESSAGELIMIT response code) break clients that don’t expect any?

• Can LIMIT response code be returned with tagged OK? (Phillip)
Open Issues

• “Because the MESSAGELIMIT is applied per-command, this seems likely to lead to inconsistencies between commands. For example, searching for UNSEEN UNDELETED messages may return more results than searching for UNSEEN or UNDELETED alone.” (Phillip)

• Clarify that MESSAGELIMIT applies to the number of existing messages iterated over in SEARCH, not on the number that matched the SEARCH criteria?
Open Issues

- Make this ENABLE-able again? (Phillip)

- The server will enforce its MESSAGELIMIT regardless of ENABLE, so it is kind of pointless

- The only thing that it might affect seems to be use of MESSAGELIMIT response code versa LIMIT response code by the server
Open Issues

• Do we need to specify CLOSE behaviour in regards to MESSAGELIMIT?

• A CLOSE can never really fail. It is also not possible to call CLOSE multiple times in a row, due to IMAP state transition from Selected to Authenticated state.

• Should CLOSE behave the same way as EXPUNGE, i.e. just perform a partial expunge operation?

• Add MESSAGELIMIT response code to CLOSE?
Next steps

- Address (or at least reply) to remaining comments from Phillip
- Some work remains on EXPUNGE/CLOSE behaviour
- MESSAGELIMIT - any interest in implementing?