

draft-ietf-marf-dkim-reporting

Murray S. Kucherawy
<msk@cloudmark.com>

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
reportopts=f ~all"`

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 "~" case, and drop "reportopts"?

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”

- “reportsmtp” 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...