

# EMAILCORE WG

## November 2023 Interim

Chairs:

Alexey Melnikov <[alexey.melnikov@isode.com](mailto:alexey.melnikov@isode.com)>

Todd Herr <[todd.herr@valimail.com](mailto: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/?group=2750f35c-c527-411f-a667-3fa9c4049f36>
- Shared note taking:
  - <https://notes.ietf.org/notes-ietf-interim-2023-emailcore-02-emailcore>
- ***Note taker?***

# Agenda (1 of 2)

- Agenda bashing, administrivia, note well (chairs) - 5 mins
- Tickets for the SMTP draft:
- #75 G.21. Appendix B and Message Submission ***<https://github.com/ietf-wg-emailcore/emailcore/issues/75>***
- #82 G.24. Describing the "Operational Requirements" Loopholes ***<https://github.com/ietf-wg-emailcore/emailcore/issues/82>***

# Agenda (2 of 2)

- Review of tickets for the A/S draft:
- #38 - Possible clarification of 78 octet limit versa the 998 line length limit
- #40 - Recommended SMTP extensions
- #51 - A/S should cover the use of email addresses in web forms
- #66 - Recommendation about timezones to use in Date and Received header fields
- #78 - Advice against using URL %-encoding on non ASCII email addresses to create ASCII version of them
- #79 - Add Internationalization Considerations section to A/S
- #80 G.6. Clarify where the protocol stands with respect to submission and TLS issues

# WG Status

- draft-ietf-emailcore-rfc5322bis-08 is ready for WGLC
- draft-ietf-emailcore-rfc5321bis-21 is pretty close to WGLC. By the end of this session WG chairs would like to get an agreement on what should be in -22, which is ready for WGLC
- draft-ietf-emailcore-as-08 is expired
  - Chairs didn't push the WG to work on this
  - But now it is time to finish it
  - The hope it is actually not very far off from being done.



# RFC 5321

Updated text in Section 1.2

In draft-ietf-emailcore-rfc5321bis-21, Section 1.2. ("History and Context for This Document"):

It also includes editorial and clarification changes that were made to RFC 2821 [34] to bring that specification to Draft Standard and similar changes to RFC 5321 [53] to bring the current document to Internet Standard **as well as changes to the description and specification of IANA registries to align with contemporary practice and thinking.**

If you have objections, raise them on the mailing list.

# RFC 5321

## Suggestion to update text about relays

- 2nd paragraph of Section 7.9 "Scope of Operation of SMTP Servers":

~~In recent years, use of the~~ relay function through arbitrary sites ~~has been used~~ as part of hostile efforts to hide the actual origins of mail. ~~Some~~ sites ~~have decided to~~ limit the use of the relay function to known or identifiable sources, ~~and~~ implementations SHOULD provide the capability to perform this type of filtering.

- John Levine suggested a replacement:

Relay function through arbitrary sites, as part of hostile efforts to hide the actual origins of mail, **has become so common that most** sites limit the use of the relay function to known or identifiable sources.

Implementations SHOULD provide **and use** the capability to perform this type of filtering.

The following sentence is unchanged:

When mail is rejected for these or other policy reasons, a 550 code SHOULD be used in response to EHLO (or HELO), MAIL, or RCPT as appropriate.

# RFC 5321

Adjust item 8 in Section 8.1.1.2 to properly reflect RFC 6409

In draft-ietf-emailcore-rfc5321bis-21 the IANA registration got updated to list RFC 2119 level requirement on applicability of an SMTP extension to SMTP Submission:

In Section 8.1.1.2:

- (8) Message submission use. Values: Keyword indicating relevance for use in message submission as described in Section 7 of RFC 6409 [47]. For any registration prior to the publication of <<This document>> for which this information was not specified in RFC 6409 or the registration request, this entry in the registry will be set to "MUST NOT".

Just checking that this change is fine with people.

# RFC 5321

## G.21. Appendix B and Message Submission (1 of 3)

<https://github.com/ietf-wg-emailcore/emailcore/issues/75>

- Background: John Klensin wrote:

Appendix B ("Generating SMTP Commands from Internet Message Format Header Fields") was written long ago and does not distinguish very carefully from the case where an MSA is involved from direct MUA-MTA communications. On the other hand, the situation it describes cannot arise with a conforming message submission system. Should it be rewritten and, if so, how much?

# RFC 5321

## G.21. Appendix B and Message Submission (2 of 3)

Suggested changes to Section 7.2 ("Blind" Copies) of draft-ietf-emailcore-rfc5321bis-21:

Remove the text in red and rename the section:

### 7.2. ~~"Blind" Copies~~ **Hiding Addresses from Trace**

Addresses that do not appear in the message header section may appear in the RCPT commands to an SMTP server for a number of reasons. The two most common involve the use of a mailing address as a "list exploder" (a single address that resolves into multiple addresses) and the appearance of "blind copies". When more than one RCPT command is present, and in order to avoid defeating some of the purpose of these mechanisms, SMTP clients and servers SHOULD NOT copy the RCPT command arguments into the header section, either as part of trace header fields or as informational or private-extension header fields. ~~Because this rule is often violated in practice, and cannot be enforced, sending SMTP systems that are aware of "bcc" use MAY find it helpful to send each blind copy as a separate message transaction containing only a single RCPT command.~~ See Section 7.6 for discussion of some related issues.

The second paragraph of 7.2 remains as-is.

# RFC 5321

## G.21. Appendix B and Message Submission (3 of 3)

The fate of draft-ietf-emailcore-rfc5321bis-21, Appendix B "Generating SMTP Commands from Internet Message Format Header Fields"

John Klensin wrote:

Appendix B contains normative text that is applicable to more than both 6409-style submission servers. Moving that text to 6409, which is, by definition, only about standard message submission systems, does not accomplish anything wrt the other ways in which an SMTP system might encounter the conditions Appendix B discusses.

# draft-levine-rfc6409bis

(1 of 4)

- Contains proposed replacement text for Generating SMTP Commands from Internet Message Format Header Fields (Appendix B of draft-ietf-emailcore-rfc5321bis-21)
- On the following slides:
  - Check that the technical context is Ok
  - Decide on approach: obsoletes or updates RFC 6409?
  - How do we handle it procedurally?

# draft-levine-rfc6409bis

(2 of 4)

Proposed replacement text for Generating SMTP Commands from Internet Message Format Header Fields (Appendix B of draft-ietf-emailcore-rfc5321bis-21) is in draft-levine-rfc6409bis.

- Is the WG happy with the text? <https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-levine-rfc6409bis/02/>
- Note that some small changes are pending as per discussion between John Levine and John Klensin
- Do people want to look at the text in real time?



# draft-levine-rfc6409bis

(3 of 4)

## Goal of the draft

- Should it obsolete(i.e. incorporate) or update RFC 6405?

# draft-levine-rfc6409bis

(4 of 4)

Procedural: How should we handle it?

This is outside of the current EMAILCORE charter.

Options:

- Recharter EMAILCORE to make it in scope?
  - As per earlier discussions: are there actually 2 separate documents?
- Recharter EMAILCORE to make rfc6409bis in scope?
- AD-sponsored?
- Fold it into A/S?
- Alexey gives up

# 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)

Todd: A/S mentions port 587 in section 6.4, but not 465.

Lots of mention of TLS in section 6, but nothing specific about TLS relay on a port other than 25.

If "TLS relay on a port other than 25" encompasses message submission on 587 (or 465) then perhaps mention that in 6.4; otherwise, close the ticket.

# Review of some A/S tickets

**<https://github.com/ietf-wg-emailcore/emailcore/issues/38>** - Possible clarification of 78 octet limit versus the 998 line length limit

Alexey commented in July 2021 that the text in 5322bis is clear on the differences between the two.

Todd concurs, and proposes that ticket be closed with no further action

**<https://github.com/ietf-wg-emailcore/emailcore/issues/40>** - Recommended SMTP extensions

Seems reasonable to ensure that these items are discussed in the A/S, as agreed to at IETF 112, per the ticket.

**<https://github.com/ietf-wg-emailcore/emailcore/issues/51>** - A/S should cover the use of email addresses in web forms

There was a call for proposed text in October 2022, but no such text appears in the ticket. Follow up with the authors.

**<https://github.com/ietf-wg-emailcore/emailcore/issues/66>** - Recommendation about timezones to use in Date and Received header fields

Status is ready to be closed, based on the belief that the topic should be addressed in 5322bis.

Confirm that it has been addressed there (either on list or by reading 5322bis) and close this ticket.

# Review of some A/S tickets

**<https://github.com/ietf-wg-emailcore/emailcore/issues/78>** - Advice against using URL %-encoding on non ASCII email addresses to create ASCII version of them

Klensin raised question on list about inserting “an explicit caution about SMTP servers or clients assuming they can apply the popular web convention of using %NN sequences as a way to encode non-ASCII characters (pct-encoded in RFC 3986) and assuming some later system will interpret it as they expect”

Klensin’s text, captured in the ticket, seems to be a good starting point for text to be added to the A/S if there’s agreement that the A/S should contain such text.

Discuss on list.

**<https://github.com/ietf-wg-emailcore/emailcore/issues/79>** - Add Internationalization Considerations section to A/S

Discuss on list whether or not the A/S should do this, and propose text there.