Towards Converged Message Abuse Reporting: IETF MARF and OMA SpamRep

Alex Bobotek (alex.bobotek@att.com) AT&T Labs

18:30 July 28, 2010 IETF MARF Working Group

Overview

- Goal: Convergence rather than competition
- Marf-base-06 & SpamRep V1 features and gaps
- Issues in convergence
- Appendix: Convergence roadmaps

Abuse Reporting Goals

- Prevent competing standards for mobile and converged abuse reporting: prevent industry fragmentation
- IETF MARF and OMA SpamRep convergence on mobile reporting standards is ideal
- Compatible standards is a second choice
 - Permit automatic translation of MARF←→SpamRep
 - Polymorphic report processing
 - Preserve Report ID (translation does not alter identity, permits association)

MARF & SpamRep Features

Feature	marf-base-06	SpamRep20100708
Supported services	Email	Email, SMS, MMS, IM
Human readable part	Yes (multipart/report)	No
Transport Protocol	Compatible with SMTP	НТТР
Multiple abuse reports per message	Undefined, unspecified, may be inconsistent with RFC 3462 (multipart/report)	Yes (each is an element within a single XML document) [With optional reference to optional corpus MIME part]
Detection Information	No (or limited to auth,)	No (or limited to auth,)
MIME types	multipart/report (with mandatory MIME part for corpus or headers)	multipart/related, application/vnd.oma.spamrep+xml
Metadata scheme	Name/value pairs	XML
Transaction Protocol	Undefined, unspecified	Yes (request/response)
Extensible attributes	Yes	No
IDs	Optional 'Original-Envelope- Id'	ReporterID, ReportID, SpamMessageID where exists
Forwarding Permissions	No	Yes

Key Convergence Issues

- •Structure of MIME parts
- •Metadata representation: XML vs Name/Value pair
- Attributes
 - Sufficiency
 - •Mutual existence (do marf-base and SpamRep have corresponding attributes?)
 - Consistent attribute naming

MARF & SpamRep Structures

multipart/report, type=feedback-report Human readable MIME part message/feedback report message/rfc822 | text/rfc822-headers

RFC 3462:

"The syntax of Multipart/Report is identical to the Multipart/Mixed content type defined in [<u>MIME</u>]. When used to send a report, the Multipart/Report content-type must be the top-level MIME content type for any report message. The report-type parameter identifies the type of report. The parameter is the MIME content sub-type of the second body part of the Multipart/Report." multipart/related application/vnd.oma.spamrep+xml <SpamRepDocument> <SpamReport> ... </SpamReport> <SpamReport> ... </SpamReport>

<SpamReport> ... </SpamReport> </SpamReportDocument> [corpus in MIME format] [corpus in MIME format]

[corpus in MIME format]

Structural of MIME Parts: Convergence Options

Single-report message options

Common report MIME type

multipart/report, type=converged-feedback-report Human readable MIME part message/feedback-report/vnd.oma.spamrep+xml [message/rfc822 | text/rfc822-headers | other MIME]

modified SpamRep

multipart/report, type=spamrep Human readable MIME part vnd.oma.spamrep+xml [Message in some MIMEtype]

marf-base

multipart/report, type=feedback-report Human readable MIME part message/feedback-report [message/rfc822 | text/rfc822-headers] Multiple-report message options

Extend multipart/report MIME type

multipart/report, type=multi-report Human Readable "this is a few reports" multipart/digest multipart/report (e.g., SMS or marf-base) multipart/report

multipart/report

New multipart/multi-report MIME type

multipart/multi-report Human Readable "this is a few reports" multipart/digest multipart/report (e.g., SMS or marf-base) multipart/report

multipart/report

Unofficial OMA request for IETF MARF WG guidance: What structure(s) might SpamRep use to facilitate SpamRep/marf convergence?

Representation Scheme: XML vs Name/Value Pairs

•Which is better, XML or name/value pairs?

- •XML is more powerful, but is it preferred?
- •Name/value pairs already implemented and used for email

Convergence options

•Cap use of name/value pairs, grow XML

- •Specify name/value pairs for email only
- •Specify XML for email, IM, SMS and MMS
- •Specify alternative representations: name/value and XML
 - •Should be defined to support automatic translation/migration

Attribute Issues

- Is there a sufficient set of attributes to ensure compatibility/convergence?
 - •Are Report-ID, Reporter-ID, and Message-ID needed in marf-base's 2nd MIME part?
 - •What happens if a server receives multiple versions/copies
 - of a single report and treats them as independent reports?
 - oScrub SpamRep attributes and attribute names for compatibility with marf
 - Mutual existence (do marf-base and SpamRep have corresponding attributes?)
 - •Should Detection Information be added? (possibly as a V 2.0 feature)
 - Add missing 'ReportedMessageProtocol' field(s)
 Should both format and transport be included?
- •Consistent attribute naming would be nice
 - •But different services use different protocol and format standards having inconsistent names. Should reporting standards be consistent with each other or the services' standards (e.g., RFC 5322 and GSM MAP)
 - •For some it is more important that they be consistent across report formats

Appendix: Roadmaps

Convergence Roadmap: SpamRep Considerations

•Attributes

- Proceed with SpamRep 'consistency' modifications
 - OScrub SpamRep attributes and attribute names for compatibility with marf
 O Add missing 'ReportedMessageProtocol' field(s) Q: format and/or transport?
 OIntroduce detection information (perhaps a V2.0 feature)

Structure

Adopt multipart/report Content-Type for Spam Reports

(but not for action requests or quarantined messages list) oFither:

In the second second

(e.g., 'type=vnd.oma.spamrep')

extend/register some multipart/report subtype to allow either XML or name/value pair usage

(including application/vnd.oma.spamrep+xml and message/feedback-report)

Convergence Roadmap: MARF Considerations

- •Attributes
 - Scrub for and include missing ID attributes, e.g., {Reporter, Message, Report}

 ODon't assume that they may be extracted from headers/transport
 OAdd missing 'ReportedMessageProtocol' field(s) Q: format and/or transport?
 OIntroduce detection information (perhaps a V2.0 feature)
- Structure
 - Consider making 3rd MIME part in optional in marf-base
 - Facilitate multiple reports per message
 - •Either as proposed in this document, or
 - •By some other converged method
- Scheme
 - •Cap use of name/value pairs (for email only)???
 - •Extend with XML for all message services???