

Author **DOMAIN** DKIM ~~Sender~~ Signing Practices ^ July 2008 Update

Jim Fenton <fenton@cisco.com>

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

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

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