

Draft-ietf-eai-popimap-downgrade-03
Post-delivery Message Downgrading for
Internationalized Email Messages

Kazunori Fujiwara, JPRS

Nov 2011

EAI WG

Changes from -02 to -03

1. Added “Updates: 5322 (if approved)” in header
 - “Section 3. Updating RFC 5322” appeared in -02
2. Added Message-ID downgrading
3. Treated Unknown Header Fields as unstructured
4. Updated and fixed IANA considerations
5. Added one sentence to Security Considerations
6. Updated TYPED address downgrading
7. Updated the example
8. Some changes

2: Message-Id Downgrading

- Min number of Message-Id, In-Reply-To, References, Resent-Message-Id fields is zero
 - RFC 5322 Section 3.6
 - These header fields may be removed (with encapsulation)
- Defined new Downgraded header fields
 - Downgraded-Message-Id
 - Downgraded-Resent-Message-Id
 - Downgraded-In-Reply-To
 - Downgraded-References
- Defined Message-Id header downgrading as ENCAPSULATION Downgrading

3: Treated Unknown Header Fields as unstructured

- Previously, Unknown Header Fields was Encapsulated to new header field which field name is the concatenation of "Downgraded-" and the original name
 - Downgraded-X-Unknown:
- RFC 5322 Section 3.6.8 “Optional Fields” says
 - Field unspecified in this document is optional-field
 - optional-field = field-name ":" unstructured CRLF
- Unknown Header Field Downgrading was changed as UNSTRUCTURED Downgrading
- Is this change OK ?

4: IANA considerations

- RFC 5504 defined many Downgraded header fields
 - All of them are unused by recent standard track documents
 - Update them to replace “experimental” with “obsoleted” and to reference this document (Or framework document ?)
- RFC 5504 requested refusing any "Downgraded-" registrations
 - It may be useless, and new updating text required
- Added new 6 Downgraded- header fields
 - Message-ID related and missed TYPED address headers
- Need more fixes

5: Security Considerations

- Added one sentence
 - Existing clients do not know new From: and Sender: header fields syntax updated by Section 3 and may get wrong when they confront<group> syntax in From: and Sender: fields.

6: Updated TYPED address downgrading

- Added missing header fields definition
 - Downgraded-Original-Recipient:
 - Downgraded-Final-Recipient:

TODO

- Commented by Chairs, but no time to update to -03
- Updating header fields definition and IANA Considerations
 - Compatible to RFC 5504
 - Compatible with IANA Registry:
<http://www.iana.org/assignments/message-headers/perm-headers.html>
 - New IANA request format

New proposal

- <addr-spec> is downgraded as “Internationalized Address” ENCODED-WORD “Removed:;”
- May I change it as ENCODED-WORD “:;” ?
- Reason
 - Easy and simple to implement
 - People who need internationalization cannot understand “Internationalized Address removed”.
 - With/Without “Internationalized Address removed”, it is a group syntax and the receiver cannot reply.

Questions

- Is it OK that treating Unknown Header Fields as unstructured ?
- Who obsoletes header fields defined by RFC 5504 ? (framework ? This document ?)
- Is removing “Internationalized Address removed” OK ?