

IMAP MESSAGELIMIT extensions

draft-ietf-extra-imap-messagelimit-04

Alexey Melnikov <alexey.melnikov@isode.com>

Arun Prakash Achuthan <arunprakash@myyahoo.com>

Vikram Nagulakonda <nvikram_imap@yahoo.com>

Luis Alves <luis.alves@lafaspot.com>

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?