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Summary of changes

• Adds support for SPF and Sender-ID
• Changes report type to “auth-failure”
• Proposes a “standard” algorithm for redaction of portions of addresses
SPF Correlation

- "v=spf1 ip4:1.2.3.4 report=foo reportoptsf="  
  This would specify that I want reports on all SPF "fails" (distinct from "softfails"). However, my "$all" means that all my non-authorized email will end up receiving "softfails", resulting in me receiving zero reports.

- Specify that one always reports on the "$all" case, and drop "reportoptsf"?
SPF Modifiers

• SPF says modifiers have to be at the end
• We should say the interpretation of modifiers before the end is undefined
SPF Includes

• Need to say what to do when SPF “include” instructions result in discovery of multiple reporting options
• Ignore them when inside “includes”?
• Apply all of them?
• Limit depth?
Redundancy to “exp”

• “reportsmtpl” is redundant to SPF’s existing “exp”
• Just remove it?
Describe the intention more

- Does it target deployers of authentication?
- Is it meant to allow implementers to debug their stacks?
- Make reference to real-world operations
Data redaction

• Wish we’d done this for marf-base!
• JD Falk splitting this into a new document
Support for IODEF

• Do we have to include it? Should we?
• Would it require changing marf-base?
Split out the SPF stuff

• Do we want to put the SPF extensions into their own document?
Break DKIM changes out

• So DKIM changes are in one document and ARF modifications are in another
• Concerns that someone implementing all of this stuff would have to follow up to five documents
Anything else?

• That’s all that was on the list, but maybe someone here has something else...