

Mail Abuse Reporting Format
Working Group
Internet-Draft
Intended status: Standards Track
Expires: August 4, 2011

J. Falk
Return Path
January 31, 2011

**A DNS TXT Record for Advertising and Discovering Willingness
to Provide or Receive ARF Reports
draft-ietf-marf-reporting-discovery-00**

Abstract

This document defines a method for network operators to advertise their willingness to send feedback about received email to other parties, and for those other parties to advertise their willingness to receive such feedback.

to receive such feedback.
parties, and for those other parties to advertise their willingness
their willingness to send feedback about received email to other
This document defines a method for network operators to advertise

draft-ietf-marf- reporting-discovery

J.D. Falk, Return Path
ietf@cybernothing.org

eases communication

- * does example.com offer ARF reports?
- * does example.com want ARF reports?
- * which report types?
- * is there a sign-up process?
- * what's the responsible person's email address?
- * *et cetera*

general characteristics

- * new TXT record published in DNS
 - * domain/hostname
 - * domain/hostname referenced by PTR (rDNS)
- * specify format desired/available
- * responsible person's email address (optional)
- * statement of policy (optional)
- * reference URI (optional)

feedback consumers

- * TXT record associated with authenticated domain or source IP (PTR)
- * policies
 - * open to reports from all sources
 - * restricted to reports from their own users
 - * closed (testing/private)

***when a Consumer requests feedback,
the Generator can use this record
to make sure that the feedback
is going to the correct place.***

feedback generators

- * TXT record associated with receiving domain
- * policies
 - * open to providing reports to any consumer
 - * open to providing reports only after an application process is completed
 - * closed (testing/private)

reports from end users?

- * notably different from other scenarios
 - * harder for MUA to guess relevant domain
 - * POP/IMAP/other
 - * message format (ARF, raw)
- * *removed from draft, available for future work*

next steps

- * continue iterating & improving
- * submit for IETF approval by September 2011

draft-ietf-marf-
reporting-discovery



Network Working Group
Internet-Draft
Intended status: Informational
Expires: September 5, 2011

J. Falk
Return Path
March 4, 2011

Redaction of Potentially Sensitive Data from Mail Abuse Reports
draft-jdfalk-marf-redaction-00

Abstract

Email messages often contain information which might be considered private or sensitive, per either regulation or social norms. When such a message becomes the subject of a report intended to be shared with other entities, the report generator may wish to redact or elide the sensitive portions of the message. This memo suggests one method for doing so effectively.

draft-jdfalk-marf-redaction

J.D. Falk, Return Path
ietf@cybernothing.org

the usual arguments

- ✱ removing *any* information from the message/rfc822 portion of an ARF report reduces the usefulness of the report
- ✱ removing *some* information from the message/rfc822 portion of an ARF report is required under privacy laws in some jurisdictions

inescapable truth

- * redaction happens today
- * redaction will continue to happen
- * *this doesn't only apply to ARF*

next steps

- * copied from *draft-ietf-marf-dkim-reporting*
- * seeking additional descriptions of *currently existing* practices
- * could merge into larger MARF BCP

draft-jdfalk-marf-
redaction



Network Working Group
Internet-Draft
Intended status: Informational
Expires: July 18, 2011

J. Falk, Ed.
Messaging Anti-Abuse Working Group
January 14, 2011

**Complaint Feedback Loop Best Current Practices
draft-jdfalk-maawg-cfblbcp-00**

Abstract

Complaint Feedback Loops similar to those described herein have existed for more than a decade, resulting in many de facto standards and best practices. This document is an attempt to codify, and thus clarify, the ways that both providers and consumers of these feedback mechanisms intend to use the feedback, describing some already-common industry best practices.

draft-jdfalk-marf- redaction

J.D. Falk, MAAWG
ietf@cybernothing.org



- * global trade association, consisting of:
 - * major mailbox providers
 - * anti-spam & security vendors
 - * email service providers
 - * related companies & organizations
- * <http://www.maawg.org/about/roster>



- * ARF started within MAAWG
 - * spun off in 2005, moved to IETF in 2010
- * *all* of the largest ARF generators are members
- * *nearly all* members who send bulk email are ARF consumers



- * not a technical standards organization
- * *this is the first experiment with publishing a MAAWG document as an IETF standard*

contents

- 3. Mailbox Providers and Feedback Providers
 - 3.1. Benefits of Providing Feedback
 - 3.2. Collecting Complaints
 - 3.3. Creating Reports
 - 3.4. Policy Concerns
 - 3.5. Handling Requests to Receive Feedback
 - 3.6. Ongoing Maintenance

contents

4. Feedback Consumers

4.1. Preparation

4.2. What You'll Receive

4.3. Handling Feedback Messages

4.4. Automatically Handling an Incoming Feedback Stream

appendices

A. Abuse Reporting Format (ARF)

A.1. A Brief History

A.2. Structure of an ARF Message

B. Using DKIM to Route Feedback

C. Unsolicited Feedback

next steps

- ✱ decide what to do with this draft
 1. publish as-is, without changes
 2. suggest changes to MAAWG
 3. write a new BCP, inspired by MAAWG's
- ✱ *MARF charter says an “ARF guidelines document” was due September 2010*

draft-jdfalk-
maawg-cfblbcp



<http://tools.ietf.org/wg/marf/>