draft-ietf-dkim-mailinglists

Murray S. Kucherawy
<msk@cloudmark.com>

MUA Advice

- Should we include an appendix discussing what we see as useful changes to MUAs?
  - For example, highlight or render the identity that has been verified by DKIM (SDID and/or AUID)

Intended Status

- Informational or BCP?
  - Current versions are Informational and thus deliberately avoid RFC2119 language and thus is more of a discussion
  - Somewhat deliberate: Do we have enough experience with all of this to make normative assertions, as would be required by a BCP?

The bits about faulty DKIM implementations

- Suggestion to remove discussion about dealing with broken DKIM implementations
  - "Are there other RFCs that do that?"
  - But then there's Postel's Law to consider

Re-signing MLMs

- Point out that an MLM that re-signs should only sign header fields that were either previously signed, or were added locally
  - …versus signing all the header fields

Remove references to ESPs

- …because they're different than any of the general models presented in the document

Message Streams

- That is, creating subdomains for use in “d=“ so that they can have different policies or accrete disjoint reputations
- Concern that this will require users to pay attention to numerous subdomains
- Doesn’t appear to be supporting consensus, but should we mention the concern?

Last Call

- Given this discussion (and some pending editorial changes), are we ready for a WGLC?