

# SPFBIS

IETF 83

Paris, France

# Agenda

1. Administivia
2. RFC 4408 issues
3. SPF RRTYPE (issue 9)
4. DNS amplification attacks (issue 24)
5. Path authorization / updating SMTP (issue 12)
6. Deployment document needed?
7. Discussion of -spfbis-experiment
8. A.O.B.

# 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
- The IESG, or any member thereof on behalf of the IESG
- Any IETF mailing list, including the IETF list itself, any working group or design team list, or any other list functioning under IETF auspices
- Any IETF working group or portion thereof
- Any Birds of a Feather (BOF) session
- The IAB or any member thereof on behalf of the IAB
- 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.

# No discussion 1

- Issue 5 (ambiguities)
  - Is there an issue here?
- Issue 7 (downcase; wait for draft)
- Issue 8 (2119 words handling; wait for draft)
- Issue 15 (MAIL FROM)
- Issue 16 (%v in ABNF grammar; wait for draft)
- Issue 17 (uric)

# No discussion 2

- Issue 18 (SMTP reply code for PermError)
- Issue 19 (Section 7 Received-SPF examples have wrong syntax)
- Issue 20 (greedy unknown-modifier)
- Issue 21 (fix domain-spec in section 6.2.1)
- Issue 22 (PermError on invalid domains)
- Issue 23 (typos)

# Believe we've completed

- 1: SERVFAIL handling
- 2: Fix erratum 2250
- 3: Fix erratum 99
- 4: check\_host
- 6: section 10.1 reorg and clarify

# Issue #10

- Suggestion to replace Received-SPF
- Is there a clear agreement? I can't tell yet

# Issue #11

- `check_host()` is an API?
- Apparent disagreements
- Is there a conclusion? I can't tell yet



# Issue #13: Best-guess

- Discussion on list inconclusive
- Is this in scope?
- If so, is there something we want to say?
  - “Bad idea, please make it stop”
  - “People have deployed it and we need to understand”
  - “You should do this”

# Rathole?

- Issue 13 caused us to open a discussion about what “widely deployed” means for this WG
- Did we resolve it? (Seemed to peter out)
- Is this something we need to answer?

# Issue #14

- Deprecate local-part macro prep
- Can we come to agreement here?

# Issue 26

- Relax syntax checking?
- Strong responses against
- Anyone want to argue in favour?
  - If not, close as will not fix

# Issue 27

- Deprecate ptr: mechanism and `%{p}` macro
- Apparent support for SHOULD NOT
- Any disagreement?

# **SPF RRTYPE (ISSUE 9)**

# **AMPLIFICATION (ISSUE 24)**

# **PATH AUTHORIZATION (ISSUE 12)**



**DO WE NEED A DEPLOYMENT DOC?**