

EMAILCORE WG

December 2022 Interim

Chairs:

Alexey Melnikov <alexey.melnikov@isode.com>

Todd Herr <todd.herr@valimail.com>

Note Well

- This is a reminder of IETF policies in effect on various topics such as patents or code of conduct. It is only meant to point you in the right direction. Exceptions may apply. The IETF's patent policy and the definition of an IETF "contribution" and "participation" are set forth in BCP 79; please read it carefully.
- As a reminder:
 - By participating in the IETF, you agree to follow IETF processes and policies.
 - If you are aware that any IETF contribution is covered by patents or patent applications that are owned or controlled by you or your sponsor, you must disclose that fact, or not participate in the discussion.
 - As a participant in or attendee to any IETF activity you acknowledge that written, audio, video, and photographic records of meetings may be made public.
 - Personal information that you provide to IETF will be handled in accordance with the IETF Privacy Statement.
 - As a participant or attendee, you agree to work respectfully with other participants; please contact the ombudsteam (<https://www.ietf.org/contact/ombudsteam/>) if you have questions or concerns about this.

Note Well

(continued)

- Definitive information is in the documents listed below and other IETF BCPs. For advice, please talk to WG chairs or ADs:
 - BCP 9 (Internet Standards Process)
 - BCP 25 (Working Group processes)
 - BCP 25 (Anti-Harassment Procedures)
 - BCP 54 (Code of Conduct)
 - BCP 78 (Copyright)
 - BCP 79 (Patents, Participation)
 - <https://www.ietf.org/privacy-policy/> (Privacy Policy)

IETF Code Of Conduct Guidelines RFC 7154

- Treat colleagues with respect
- Speak slowly and limit the use of slang
- Dispute ideas by using reasoned argument
- Use best engineering judgment
- Find the best solution for the whole Internet
- Contribute to the ongoing work of the group and the IETF

Administrivia

- This session is being recorded
- Meetecho:
 - <https://meetings.conf.meetecho.com/interim/?short=337cb9b1-ac73-4e7c-9b59-46bf5272fc91>
- Shared note taking:
 - <https://notes.ietf.org/notes-interim-emailcore-dec-2022>
- In room participants: please use masks
- ***Note taker?***

Agenda (1 of 2)

- Tickets for the Message Format and SMTP drafts:
- #81 Separate registry for Trace Header Fields? [**https://github.com/ietf-wg-emailcore/emailcore/issues/81**](https://github.com/ietf-wg-emailcore/emailcore/issues/81)
- Tickets for the SMTP draft:
- #76 G.22. IANA Registration Model for Registries Other than Service Extensions [**https://github.com/ietf-wg-emailcore/emailcore/issues/76**](https://github.com/ietf-wg-emailcore/emailcore/issues/76)
- #67 Additional-registered-clauses subregistry needs to be properly defined in the IANA Considerations section [**https://github.com/ietf-wg-emailcore/emailcore/issues/67**](https://github.com/ietf-wg-emailcore/emailcore/issues/67)
- #56 (Relax IANA registration policy for SMTP extensions) [**https://github.com/ietf-wg-emailcore/emailcore/issues/56**](https://github.com/ietf-wg-emailcore/emailcore/issues/56)
- #71 SMTP Registration template should have a field specifying level of approval [**https://github.com/ietf-wg-emailcore/emailcore/issues/71**](https://github.com/ietf-wg-emailcore/emailcore/issues/71)
- #68 RFC 8126 requires specifying "Change Controller" and Change Control procedure [**https://github.com/ietf-wg-emailcore/emailcore/issues/68**](https://github.com/ietf-wg-emailcore/emailcore/issues/68)

Agenda (2 of 2)

- Tickets for the A/S draft:
- #80 G.6. Clarify where the protocol stands with respect to submission and TLS issues **<https://github.com/ietf-wg-emailcore/emailcore/issues/80>**
- #38 *(Possible clarification of 78 octet limit versa the 998 line length limit)*
<https://github.com/ietf-wg-emailcore/emailcore/issues/38>
- #66 *Recommendation about timezones to use in Date and Received header fields* **<https://github.com/ietf-wg-emailcore/emailcore/issues/66>**

RFC 5322/5321

Trace header fields

Recent mailing list and off-list discussions about trace header fields made it clear to chairs that we are not quite ready to discuss this at the interim today.

To help the process EMAILCORE chairs are creating a Design Team to hash out issues and prepare decisions and text for WG decisions. The Design Team will consist of the co-chairs, John Klensin and Pete Resnick (as editors of 5321bis/5322bis).

If people want to be included in the Design Team, please let co-chairs know ASAP.

RFC 5321

G.22. IANA Registration Model for Registries Other Than Service Extensions

<https://github.com/ietf-wg-emailcore/emailcore/issues/76>

- 8.1.2. Address Literal Tags

Additional literal types require standardization before being used; none are anticipated at this time.

Currently registered with IANA:

IPv6

- **Standards Action?**

RFC 5321

G.22. IANA Registration Model for Registries Other Than Service Extensions

<https://github.com/ietf-wg-emailcore/emailcore/issues/76>

- 8.1.3. Mail Transmission Types

The third, "Mail Transmission Types" [58], established by RFC 821 and renewed by this specification, is a registry of link and protocol identifiers to be used with the "via" and "with" subclauses of the time stamp ("Received:" header field) described in Section 4.4. Link and protocol identifiers in addition to those specified in this document may be registered only by ***standardization*** or ***by way of an RFC-documented, IESG-approved, Experimental protocol extension***

- **Standards Action or IESG approved Experimental RFC?**

- Or just **IETF Review** (basically as above + IETF Stream Informational)?

RFC 5321

G.22. IANA Registration Model for Registries Other Than Service Extensions

<https://github.com/ietf-wg-emailcore/emailcore/issues/76>

WITH protocol

Additional standard names for protocols are registered with the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) in the "mail parameters" registry [11].

Currently registered with IANA:

SMTP
ESTMP
LMTP
Different variants of the above including use of TLS and authentication. 18 values in total.

- What the draft is currently saying: **Standards Action or IESG approved Experimental RFC?**
- Or just **IETF Review** (basically as above + IETF Stream Informational)?

RFC 5321

G.22. IANA Registration Model for Registries Other Than Service Extensions

<https://github.com/ietf-wg-emailcore/emailcore/issues/76>

VIA link types

The gateway SHOULD indicate the environment and protocol in the "via" clauses of Received header field(s) that it supplies.

Additional standard names for links are registered with the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA). "Via" is primarily of value with non-Internet transports.

Currently registered with IANA:

UUCP
TCP

- What the draft is currently saying: **Standards Action or IESG approved Experimental RFC?**
- Or just **IETF Review** (basically as above + IETF Stream Informational)?

MULE (RFC 8494)?

RFC 5321

G.22. IANA Registration Model for Registries Other Than Service Extensions

<https://github.com/ietf-wg-emailcore/emailcore/issues/76>

<https://github.com/ietf-wg-emailcore/emailcore/issues/67>

8.1.4. Additional Registered Clauses

Basically extra attributes specified in Received header field.

Values currently registered with IANA:

TLS	ciphers
group	TLS DH group name
priority	SMTP priority extension (number)
state	quarantine, etc.

- **Standards Action or IESG approved Experimental RFC?**
- Or just **IETF Review** (basically as above + IETF Stream Informational)?
- **FCFS?**

RFC 5321

Relax IANA registration policy for SMTP extensions

<https://github.com/ietf-wg-emailcore/emailcore/issues/56>

Background:

SMTP extension registry registration procedure currently says:

Standards-Track or **Experimental** RFCs specifically approved by the IESG for this purpose.

With the removal of restriction on extensions starting with "X", at least **IETF Informational** RFCs should be allowed. What about **non IETF stream Informational/Experimental**?

RFC 5321

Relax IANA registration policy for SMTP extensions

<https://github.com/ietf-wg-emailcore/emailcore/issues/56>

The latest proposal on the table is to define 2 registration models at the discretion of the registrant:

1. For those who consider community review important and/or want an IETF stamp of approval => **IETF Review** with a strong preference for Standards-Track or IETF-approved Experimental
2. For those looking for a minimal effort => **FCFS**.

If the new approach is adopted, some of the associated text will need reworking. If it is not, no point.

Details of the new approach ("Option 2") are in Section 8.1.1.2 of rfc5321bis-16, but the material from the beginning of 8.1.1 to the start of "Option 1" and following "Option 2" should also be reviewed.

RFC 5321/5322

Separate registry for Trace Header Fields?

<https://github.com/ietf-wg-emailcore/emailcore/issues/81>

The proposal on the table is to extend **Message Header Field Names** registry with trace header field information

Do we want dual registry (IETF review & FCFS), similar to what was proposed for the SMTP extensions in rfc5321bis-16?

A/S

G.6. Clarify where the protocol stands with respect to submission and TLS issues

<https://github.com/ietf-wg-emailcore/emailcore/issues/80>

1. submission on port 587
2. submission on port 465
3. TLS relay on a port different from 25 (whenever)
4. Recommendations about general use of transport layer (hop by hop) security, particularly encryption including consideration of RFC 8314.

The MTA-to-MTA relay case is already covered by the now closed ticket #54 ("Hop-by-hop Authentication and/or Encryption"), in particular it mentions MTA-STS [RFC8461] and DANE for SMTP [RFC7672].

Section 6.1 has text about TLS protecting messages in transit, but not in storage. So it wouldn't help against a compromised server. (Might need to clarify the last point)

Do we need to say anything about submission and RFC 8314 ("Cleartext Considered Obsolete: Use of Transport Layer Security (TLS) for Email Submission and Access")?

A/S

Possible clarification of 78 octet limit versus the 998 line length limit

<https://github.com/ietf-wg-emailcore/emailcore/issues/38>

rfc5322bis seems to be clear on this.

Should we add any clarifications or examples to A/S? For example "message bodies should always be folded at 78 octets, but longer lines in header fields are OK"?

Proposed addition:

Section 2.1.1 of [rfc5322bis] states Line Length Limits and this document doesn't change any of the requirements stated there.

From observation of existing email messages implementations seem to be more tolerant for lines longer than 78 octets in the header section of a message or a body part.

However the 78 octet limit is more important for message bodies that use "quoted-printable" or "base-64" Content-Transfer-Encodings, as some decoders will use fixed size buffers for decoding message bodies.

A/S

Recommendation about timezones to use in Date and Received header fields

<https://github.com/ietf-wg-emailcore/emailcore/issues/66>

Any text to add? No clear consensus on the mailing list so far.