What’s new this time?

- New (-04) draft published July 2
- Significant changes as compared with -ssp-03:
  - ASP ➔ ADSP throughout (e.g., _asp now _adsp)
  - Parent domain check removed per WG consensus
  - Testing flag removed (no flags at all now; registry removed)
  - ABNF: *WSP changed to *FWS [issue 1543]
- Wording changes
  - Abstract streamlined [issue 1575]
  - Wildcard discussion revised [issue 1576]
## Remaining ADSP issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1543</td>
<td>Remove [FWS]</td>
<td>[FWS] vs. *WSP vs. *FWS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1571</td>
<td>Examples</td>
<td>No examples added in -04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1575</td>
<td>Streamline abstract</td>
<td>Antecedent for “they”, “their”?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1576</td>
<td>Revise wildcard discussion</td>
<td>Require record start with “dkim=“?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Multiple records returned?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Describe dangers of wildcards?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1579</td>
<td>ADSP Result Set/Status Codes</td>
<td>Terminology, esp. “discardable”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Resent-* header fields</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Issue 1543: Remove [FWS]

- In ssp-01, [FWS] in ABNF was changed to *WSP
  
  FWS is used in header fields, requires whitespace after CRLF to indicate continuation
  
  *WSP was thought to better define syntax requirements for DNS TXT records

- But RFC 4871 uses [FWS] in selector record syntax, and we might want to be consistent

  Simplification of parsers

- ssp-04 changed it again, this time to *FWS (error?)

- What should we choose? If *WSP, should this be noted in RFC 4871 errata?
Issue 1571: Examples

- The examples in Appendix A don’t give any examples of real ADSP records
- Should be easy to add some
Issue 1575: Streamline abstract

- Abstract “streamlined” in ssp-04
- Latent issue: Antecedent of “they”, “their”
- Suggested text:
  …that can advertise whether a domain signs its outgoing mail…
Issue 1576: Revise wildcard discussion

- Several sub-issues
- Use of wildcards on TXT records
  Does it do anything useful? Should it be allowed?
- Spillover of other wildcard TXT records into ADSP lookups
  They will spill over if they exist and ADSP doesn’t
  E.g., *.example.com TXT record will be returned for _adsp._domainkey.example.com TXT
- Do we need a distinguishing feature in ADSP records?
  Always begin record with dkim=
  Not a sufficient check for record validity, but may make it easier
Issue 1579: ADSP Result Set/Status Codes

- Status codes: Defining behavior of what happens with Discardable
  Mission creep?

- Discardable vs. Resent-* header fields
  Does Discardable represent a frontal assault on 2822upd Resent-* fields?

- Some sentiment that the name Discardable is wrong