

Reject/ereject

(draft-ietf-sieve-refuse-reject-07.txt)

- Open Issues after IETF LC/IESG review:
 - SecDir review: return-path verification is underspecified
 - The document suggests discarding message when return-path verification fails
 - Suggestion to add a requirement to log such cases, in order to prevent mail from silently disappearing
 - Add some examples of return-path verification techniques?
 - Many people: “silent upgrade” of reject to ereject
 - SecDir review: “Reason text uses UTF-8 to align an SMTP language extension spec. The reason text value may be inappropriate even if the client and server negotiate the use of an SMTP extension (i.e., a different language may be used by the client/server). Should UTF-8 be used here without a normative reference to support it?”
 - Arnt: allow sending DSNs instead of MDNs when appropriate (e.g. when reject is done based on a sysadmin instructions)

iHave

- draft-freed-sieve-ihave-01.txt
- Recent changes
 - Added the “error” action that causes a runtime error with the specified text
 - Updated references to published RFCs

Notary

- draft-freed-sieve-notary-01.txt
- WGLC ended
 - Some typos found
 - Suggestion to add ORCPT example

Sieve representation in XML

- draft-freed-sieve-in-xml-01.txt - expired
- Recent changes:
 - Sieve comments are now represented as <comment> XML element, instead of XML comments
 - Updated references to published RFCs
- Ned said that RelaxNG grammar is missing, but otherwise ready for WGLC

ManageSieve

- draft-ietf-sieve-managesieve-01.txt
- Open Issues:
 - Make RENAME, CHECKSCRIPT and NOOP one extension?
 - Chris Newman: Allow URIs in PUTSCRIPT
 - Should this be an extension?
 - Is OWNER capability needed?
 - SCRAM as the mandatory-to-implement SASL mechanism

METADATA

- draft-melnikov-sieve-imapext-metadata-04.txt
- In WGLC now
 - Some older comments from Philip regarding dropping metadata existence check test
- Please review the document!!!