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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?