EMAILCORE WG
IETF 122
March 2025

Chairs:
Alexey Melnikov <alexey.melnikov@isode.com>
Todd Herr <todd@someguyinva.com>

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)

IETF Code Of Conduct Guidelines RFC 7154

- Treat colleagues with respect

- Speak slowly and limit the use of slang

- Dispute ideas by using reasoned argument

- Use best engineering judgment

- Find the best solution for the whole Internet

- Contribute to the ongoing work of the group and the IETF

Administrivia

- This session is being recorded

- Meetecho:

  - https://meetings.conf.meetecho.com/ietf122/?session=33911

- Shared note taking:

  - https://notes.ietf.org/notes-ietf-122-emailcore

- ***Note taker***?

Agenda

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

- Review currently open tickets on A/S and WGLC feedback
  - ***https://github.com/ietf-wg-emailcore/emailcore/issues/***

- New item for possible adoption: **draft-melnikov-smtp-iana-cleanup-00**

WG Status

- draft-ietf-emailcore-rfc5322bis is approved!

- draft-ietf-emailcore-rfc5321bis-41 is approved!!🕺💃🍻

- draft-ietf-emailcore-as-15 is post WGLC.

A/S slide deck from Ken

draft-melnikov-smtp-iana-cleanup: Further work on SMTP Extension Registry

- Alexey's Proposal:

  - rfc5321bis does a minimal cleanup and restructuring of SMTP related stuff. (Basically what it does now, with some small fixes.) It shouldn't clean up things which are already wrong or provide information that should have been provided by extensions, as this can potentially take weeks/months to sort out.

  - This will leave lots of fields in the SMTP Extension registry marked as "not provided"/"none" or just having references to RFCs in them.

  - draft-melnikov-smtp-iana-cleanup is a separate Standards Track draft that fixes or completes templates:

    - Fix "EHLO parameters" field for DELIVERBY, FUTURERELEASE and LIMITS SMTP extensions.

    - Fill in missing "Message submission Use and Values" values, when not provided in Section 7 of RFC 6409.

    - Add "Length Added" values from published RFCs (when available) or calculate them (when not).

    - Update "Additional verbs" and "MAIL/RCPT Parameter Values" from existing RFCs.

SMTP Extension registry examples (after rfc5321bis)

EHLO Keyword	Description	EHLO Parameters	Additional verbs	MAIL/ RCPT Parameter Values	RegMethod	Message submission Use and Values	Length Added	Contact/ Change Controller	Reference	Note
AUTH	Authentication	SASL mechanism names	**[RFC4954]**	**[RFC4954]**	IETF	MUST	**Not supplied**	IETF / IETF	[RFC4954]	
BURL	Remote Content	Permitted URL prefixes	**[RFC4468]**	**[RFC4468]**	IETF	***MUST NOT***	**Not supplied**	IETF / IETF	[RFC4468]	Submit [RFC6409] only. Not for use with SMTP on port 25.
SHINY	***My shiny SMTP extension***	**Not supplied**	**Not supplied**	**Not supplied**	FCFS	**Not supplied**	**Not supplied**	John Doe/ Shiny Corp		

SMTP Extension registry examples (after draft-melnikov-smtp-iana-cleanup)

EHLO Keyword	Description	EHLO Parameters	Additional verbs	MAIL/ RCPT Parameter Values	RegMethod	Message submission Use and Values	Length Added	Contact/ Change Controller	Reference	Note
AUTH	Authentication	SASL mechanism names	AUTH	AUTH parameter to MAIL command	IETF	MUST	500	IETF / IETF	[RFC4954]	
BURL	Remote Content	Permitted URL prefixes	BURL	none	IETF	*MAY*	0	IETF / IETF	[RFC4468]	Submit [RFC6409] only. Not for use with SMTP on port 25.
SHINY	*My shiny SMTP extension*	**Not supplied**	**Not supplied**	**Not supplied**	FCFS	**Not supplied**	**Not supplied**	John Doe/ Shiny Corp		

draft-melnikov-smtp-iana-cleanup: Next Steps

- Adopt this draft. This draft can be processed by either EMAILCORE or MAILMAINT WG.

- The only work needed on the document that I know of is adding "Length added" values for various extensions.

Next steps for EMAILCORE WG

- Ken and John K. to update A/S based on WGLC comments and some remaining changes agreed at the interim and today.

- Alexey to update draft-melnikov-smtp-iana-cleanup and ask for adoption in EMAILCORE / MAILMAINT - not necessarily in that order.

Backup slides

- What John Klensin already did in rfc5321bis-42 follows...

Alexey: "1) Remove all non RFC Editor cref notes."

John:

There is only one non RFC Editor cref note left in -41, it is in Section 8:

// Note to WG: As noted at the Interim, the email message accompanying the posting of -41 on 2025-02-21, and a few messages in between, this section has become the source of debate between IANA and the author and chairs. It has gotten extremely long in the process. Please see that message to the list and comment on whether we should continue to struggle with this on-list (the private conversations are becoming concerning), further delaying getting 5321bis to the RFC Editor, or whether we should remove the material that constitutes specific instructions about registry organization and contents to a separate document and more quickly close this one out./

Proposal on what to do with rfc5321bis (2 of 6)

Alexey: 2) Remove the "Historical note" in Section 8.3.2 (Changes to the top-level "MAIL Parameters" Registry Group)

Historical note:

The quantity and complexity of the changes below are largely due to registry organization decisions made in the fairly distant past by IANA and, in retrospect, not made optimally. For example, Section 2.2.2 of RFC 2821 specified information that must be specified when extensions are registered. IANA chose to capture that information in four fields -- "EHLO Keyword", "Description", "Reference", and "Note" -- leaving some of it out and the rest to presumably be captured in the the references and notes. RFC 5321 carried that text forward, as did versions of the current document until the middle of 2022, when the WG started to make decisions to be   more explicit about what belonged in the registry (content, not organization). When combined with IANA's expecting much more explicit instructions, the result became the more detailed and complex registry instructions below, reorganizing material that should have been present all along rather than demanding significant new material.

Options:

• Remove the note (*** - Alexey's preference**)

• Keep, but adjust to clarify that IANA has not made the unilateral decision on this (they didn't!)

• Remove the whole section?

Proposal on what to do with rfc5321bis (3 of 6)

Alexey: 3) Make the following changes to section 8.3.3.2

8.3.3.2. Fields for Registry Entries

 (1) Add fields to the list of registered extensions "Additional verbs", "MAIL/RCPT Parameter Values" as specified in detail in Section 8.1.1.3 and **"Contact"** as described in Section 8.1.1.3, Paragraph 4, Item 11. **For extensions registered prior to the date this document is posted, the value of those fields should be a reference to the document that now appears in the "Reference" field.**

Alexey: should we drop "Contact" from the list above, as populating it with RFC references (as now) seems weird?

Alexey: 3) Make the following changes to section 8.3.3.2

Add after (3):

(4) Add all other fields listed in Section 8.1.1.3, but not explicitly described above to the registry. In particular, the "Message submission Use and Values", "Contact" and "Change Controller" fields have special instructions on how to populate them.

(5) For entries that have the value "Legacy" in the "RegMethod" field, the "Contact" and "Change Controller" will be taken from the "Reference" field and the remaining fields will be filled in as "Not supplied".

Proposal on what to do with rfc5321bis (5 of 6)

IANA asked for something like the following to be added to the document:

All references to RFC 5321 in the IANA registries should be replaced with references to this document, except for occurrences at the following URLs: <list of URLs>

Alexey: rfc5321bis-41 now includes this text, without the list of URLs. Suggestion to move this text to draft-melnikov-smtp-iana-cleanup, as the task of cleaning up IANA registry doesn't seem like the task that rfc5321bis should be doing.

IANA has confirmed that they don't mind which document (rfc5321bis or draft-melnikov-smtp-iana-cleanup) includes this information

Proposal on what to do with rfc5321bis (6 of 6)

Notes on Reading This Draft

This note is to be removed before publishing as an RFC.

Version -39 of this draft is posted 2025-01-15 for the convenience of the WG in preparation for the online interim meeting scheduled for 2025-01-17. While all earlier comments other than those addressed to IANA or the RFC Editor have been removed, some of the remaining one have been edited and a few new ones have been added to facilitate WG review. The draft contains additional changes tentatively made in response to comments from the IESG review and an IANA follow-up to the 2024-12-17 review. Despite several requests, neither of those IANA reviews has made it into the datatracker. A more detailed summary of changes to this I-D since the last posted draft is in Appendix F.10.

Alexey: Please remove or edit this note. IANA issues were posted into datatracker and we now have acknowledgement from IANA that the latest proposed changes (previous slides) are good enough.