Yet Another Mail

Working Group

IETF 81

July 26, 2011

Note Well

Any submission to the IETF intended by the Contributor for publication as all or part of an IETF Internet-Draft or RFC and any statement made within the context of an IETF activity is considered an "IETF Contribution". Such statements include oral statements in IETF sessions, as well as written and electronic communications made at any time or place, which are addressed to:

- the IETF plenary session,
- any IETF working group or portion thereof,
- the IESG or any member thereof on behalf of the IESG,
- the IAB or any member thereof on behalf of the IAB,
- any IETF mailing list, including the IETF list itself, any working group or design team list, or any other list functioning under IETF auspices,
- the RFC Editor or the Internet-Drafts function

All IETF Contributions are subject to the rules of RFC 5378 and RFC 3979 (updated by RFC 4879).

Statements made outside of an IETF session, mailing list or other function, that are clearly not intended to be input to an IETF activity, group or function, are not IETF Contributions in the context of this notice. Please consult RFC 5378 and RFC 3979 for details.

A participant in any IETF activity is deemed to accept all IETF rules of process, as documented in Best Current Practices RFCs and IESG Statements.

A participant in any IETF activity acknowledges that written, audio and video records of meetings may be made and may be available to the public.

Pass the blue sheets around

- We have a note taker
  - Thank you Murray ☺
- Need a jabber channeler

Finding Yammerers

- Mailing List:
    - yam@ietf.org
- Jabber:
    - xmpp:yam@jabber.ietf.org
- Audio Stream:
    - http://ietf81streaming.dnsalias.net/ietf/ietf802.m3u
- Meeting Materials:
    - https://datatracker.ietf.org/meeting/81/materials.html#wg-yam
- WG Info
    - http://datatracker.ietf.org/wg/yam
    - http://trac.tools.ietf.org/wg/yam
    - http://trac.tools.ietf.org/wg/yam/trac/wiki

Agenda

- 60 minutes – 17:10 – 18:10

- Note well - 1 minute (1710-1711)
- Agenda bashing - 4 minutes (1711-1715)
- Status of draft-ietf-yam-rfc4409bis – 10 minutes (1715-1725)
- Rechartering – 35 minutes (1725-1800)
- Any Other Business – 10 minutes (1800-1810)

4409bis Status

4409bis Status

- John Klensin & Randall Gellens

- WG Last Call past

- draft-ietf-yam-4409bis-01.txt posted 7/25

- Ready for IETF Last Call

A question

- From email to yam list, John Klensin, 5/27/2011:

  - "To me, 4409bis is not only worth doing in and of itself, it is a bit of a test case as to whether we can actually open up documents and clean them up as needed to advance them in the Standard Track (or just clean them up) without taking the opportunity to reexamine the protocol, various bits of advice, etc.

  - "If we cannot do that with 4409bis, I think the WG will need to look very carefully at the value proposition associated with other specs, especially if a two-step standards process is adopted [that] essentially just redefines all of the YAM document

Charter Discussion

Our WG's Goals

- Advance documents to Full Standard
  - Fixing things as needed
  - ***NOT*** doing a rewrite (significant technical work is explicitly disallowed in the charter)

- Process Experiment
  - Experiment on a way to get documents moved to Full Standard
  - Act as a catalyst

- On hiatus for past year because of Two Track I-D
  - draft-housley-two-maturity-levels

"Conditions are never just right. People who delay action until all factors are favorable do nothing."

– William Feather

Where are we?

- 1 year later: Two-Track has *not* been adopted yet

- Should indecision there prevent work finishing up 5321bis, 5322bis and others?
  - We are in process of finishing up 4409bis now.
  - These others *could* be finished long before we get a decision on Two-Track
  - Or maybe not. How's your crystal ball?
  - Is there important work to be done irrespective of Two-Track?

Proposed New Charter

- Removes our current 2-step process (eval doc followed by updated). Any evaluation would be done only on mailing list.
    - Doesn't remove the need for the analysis.
- Maintains wording about only making non-substantive changes
- Remaining specs from original charter:
    - Message Submit, SMTP, Message Format
    - MIME
    - DSN, Multipart/Report, MDN
    - Content-language, Content-md5

Proposed Charter Text

- The Yet Another Mail (YAM) WG will review and optionally revise existing Internet Mail specifications.

  YAM will focus strictly on advancing email-related specifications for which the

Proposed Charter Text

- Wide deployment and use of interoperable implementations of an existing standards-track protocol demonstrates a presumption that the existing specification is adequate

(continued)

- The WG group will consider working on the following documents which are currently Draft Standards or BCPs:

    - RFC 2045, 2046, 2047, 2049 MIME base specs
    - RFC 3461 DSNs
    - RFC 3462 Multipart/Report
    - RFC 3464 Message Format for DSNs
    - RFC 3798 Message Disposition Notification
    - RFC 4409 Message Submission
    - RFC 5321 SMTP
    - RFC 5322 Message Format
    - RFC 1864 Content-MD5

Open Mike

- Do we recharter or shut down?
- If we recharter:
  - Do we have enough useful energy to merit continuing?
  - Is this the right charter?
- If we shut down:
  - What do we do with email work?
  - Shift updates to appswg and individual submissions?
  - Form a different (possibly) virtual "mail wg"?

Any Other Business

- Multipart/Report – Murray Kucherawy
- Other topics?