

UA EAI WG Meeting

02 August 2022

Attendees

Mark Svancarek
Nitin Walia
Jim DeLaHunt
Harsha Wijayawardhana
Abdalmonem Galila
Adolf Sedem Adu
Carine L. Malor
Georgia Osborn
Marvin Woo
Olévié Agbenyo KOUAMI
Seda Akbulut

Agenda

1. Welcome and roll call
2. Reviewing the new comments on the [self-certification guide](#)
3. [Statement of Work \(SOW\)](#) for E1.1 and E1.2
4. The next action items in the FY23 Action Plan to be worked on:
 - a) E3.1 and E3.2 will be done in parallel
5. AOB

Meeting Recording:

<https://icann.zoom.us/rec/share/sUzaPIQeC2GemuYLTjGLwp85jst5ggfFDzV334gtG-7gax1Zon1Ft36yBjgzhl.pKEMZfOI-rR2S7pt>
Passcode: mC4&9p*X94

Meeting Notes

Mark greeted all the attendees and explained what was discussed in the last meeting. He said that there were certain problems on the technical fronts and it was decided that they should be reviewed by a technical person. Mark shared that some technical questions were sent out specifically to finish the guide. He mentioned that once the guide is completed a vendor will be hired to test the compatibility of email offerings.

Nitin started to go over the answers his team provided on the EAI questions. He explained the responses.

MUA:

First response that Nitin shared was regarding MUA. Nitin shared that according to the technical team, submission should be used in case of MUA.

“Clarification : SMTP is a protocol used for mail exchange and submission is an action taken by MUA to submit email to the SMTP server. “Submission” should be used in case of MUA.”

Abdalmonem shared that MUA is not for email submission only. He had shared this concern before. Nitin agreed and clarified that according to the technical team response on whether to use “email relay” or “email submission” term, we should not use email relay, but the email submission should be used.

Abdalmonem suggested that MUA should be replaced by MTA. Mark commented that this problem is arising because in some places we have combined the MUA with web mail clients, which confuses the issue of whether it’s a pure MUA or MUA combined with MTA. Abdalmonem agreed. Mark said that this is an issue that needs to be addressed.

Olivier asked the meaning of some acronyms. It is decided to add MUA, MTA, SMTP and similar acronyms in a reference section in the self-certification guide.

Nitin responded that MUA is client software that a user invokes directly to send and receive email. When a person “A” wants to send an email message to another person, “B,” he starts the Mail User Agent of his choice, writes his message, and clicks “Send.” Person “A’s” MUA contacts the Simple Mail Transfer Protocol (SMTP) server.

Nitin shared that the next question was about the originator header. MUA.24 p8.

“Clarification: RFC 6530,6531,6532 mentions “originator header” as “From:” .”

Reponse to MUA.25

“Clarification: RFC 6530,6531,6532 mentions “destination address header” as “To:” .”

Response to MUA.33, p. 11:

Mark moved forward to MUA.33 and explained to the attendees what MIME is. Seda mentioned that there are some more questions in the comments. Mike addressed the questions in the comments.

“Clarification : Refer to RFC 6532”

Nitin shared that regarding the MIME there was a concern raised by John. Concern was why we should keep it as silver or gold. Nitin shared that John mentioned that this is something very basic which should be available to every email system. And it was already available at legacy email systems. For Nitin, that could be another reason why we kept it silver. Mark shared that since it is fundamental it could be silver, unless it's fundamental to email.

Seda shared Champika's comment about John's comment. “In EAI the focus is the message envelope that contains the recipient and return addresses. So for the purpose of EAI delivery, MIME (or 8BITMIME) is out of scope.” To Champika, “actually John is also saying the same thing. Basically he is saying that to send any email with attachment what you need is the message envelope. (which is correct)”.

Abdalmonem said that MIME doesn't relate to EAI. It is only about the body of the message. Abdalmonem supported that MIME does not have any relation with EAI. You only add SMTPUTF8, not the MIME. At the same time, the header is related to the encoding not related to the MIME. MIME doesn't care about EAI at all.

Nitin shared that MIME was fundamental and it has nothing to do with EAI. Nitin said that Multipurpose Internal Mail Extensions (MIME) is a standard that was proposed in order to expand the limited capabilities of email as a kind of an add-on or a supplementary protocol that allows non-ASCII data to be sent as MTP. Nitin shared that it allowed users to exchange different kinds of data files on the internet like audio, video, images and public application programs as well. Nitin said in case of something fundamental like this, it has to be silver. Mark agreed with Nitin.

Jim asked a question from the explanation of MUA.33 about “message/global” and is it relevant to self-certification? Abdalmonem said that MIME is not related to EAI, and MIME could be used for the encoding of the content of the body or the display name of the email address which is non-ASCII. And most of the operating systems now support UTF-8. Harsha agreed. Nitin responded by saying that the MUA should display email addresses properly. And any MUA which supports UTF-8, which is a

fundamental requirement for an EAI email address automatically, becomes EAI compliant. Abdalmonem agreed with Nitin.

Nitin asked why MIME is there for John's test case.

Mark added that it's the word, quote "these extensions", that is the cause of confusion. Mark shared that for now MUA.33 is silver.

Mark referred to John Klensin's file in the below link and referred to the Introduction:

<https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/html/draft-ietf-eai-framework-05#section-1>

"Without the extensions defined here, or some equivalent set, the only way to incorporate non-ASCII characters in any part of email addresses is to use [RFC2047](#) coding to embed them in what [RFC 2822](#) [[RFC2822](#)] calls the "display name" (known as a "name phrase" or by other terms elsewhere) of the relevant headers."

Abdalmonem stated that MIME defines an encoding mechanism for some specific message header fields to accommodate non-ASCII data. However, it does not permit the use of email addresses that include non-ASCII characters.

Jim raised whether "message/global" is relevant to EAI.

For the definition of "message/global", he referred to RFC6532, an EAI spec. <https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/rfc6532/>

"This document specifies an enhancement to the Internet Message Format [RFC5322] and to MIME that permits the direct use of UTF-8, rather than only ASCII, in header field values, including mail addresses. A new media type, message/global, is defined for messages that use this extended format. This specification also lifts the MIME restriction on having non-identity content-transfer-encodings on any subtype of the message top-level type so that message/global parts can be safely transmitted across existing mail infrastructure." (Source: RFC6532)"

Nitin and Abdalmonem have the idea that the encoding is inherited from the operating system. Harsha said he is not sure about this, especially displaying

Sinhala it did not work. Then Abdalmonem clarified that it inherits characteristics from the processor.

For MUA33, Harsha suggested we need to check this. Harsha has action item to look into whether encoding is inherited from the operating system

Jim suggested removing MUA33 and write that it should support the RFC6532 instead. Or do we discard message/global entirely? And also provide two possible solutions to the problem. Mark added some remarks about the solutions provided by Jim. Jim added that RFC 6532 seems to say that you can use UTF-8 directly in the message header and it does not say that it's based on operating system definition.

Mark responded by saying that this RFC was written by Sean Steel of Microsoft, and Marks knows him well. He asked Seda to invite Shawn Steele to this community to talk about MUA.33 based on the RFC he authored. <https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/rfc6532/>. (Shawn.Steele@microsoft.com). Seda asked Mark if we invite Shawn only, or other authors as well. Mark responded, he knows Sean well but not the other members. So, we will only invite Shawn.

Nitin suggested putting his team's responses in the EAI Questions document to avoid going through two documents simultaneously in the next meeting. Mark mentioned that he hasn't looked at RFC 6855 and that he has looked at 6530. Nitin responded by saying that it is the RFC that covers the majority of things.

Nitin shared that the document has one last thing that is related to IMAP download issues. And the clarification is given in the item mailbox and the address can be used interchangeably. Mark suggested that comments at the top of the IMAP section would be sufficient. Nitin agreed.

Mark concluded by saying that we proceed with our other plan which was to try and get the feedback and have this document as the draft to go back to working on our SOW next week.

Response to IMAP.11 and MSA.4

Clarification: The terms mailbox and address can be used interchangeably.
Refer rfc 5321

Next week's agenda is set as doing the final cleanup on self certification guide, and then to work on the SOW.

Next Meeting: Tuesday 9nd August 2022 UTC 1430 -1530

Action items

| No. | Action Item | Owner |
|-----|--|---------------|
| 1 | MUA, MTA, SMTP and similar acronyms will be defined in a reference section in the self-certification guide. | EAI WG |
| 2 | Check if the encoding is inherited from the operating system (for Sinhala for Harsha) Clarification regarding whether RFC 6532 is based on operating system definition or not. | Harsha / /All |
| 3 | Invite Shawn Steele to this community to talk about MUA.33 based on the RFC he authored https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/rfc6532 Shawn.Steele@microsoft.com | Seda |
| 4 | Put responses on the same google doc (EAI Questions). | Nitin |