

# **UA EAI WG Meeting**

# 13 July 2021

#### **Attendees**

Mark Datysgeld Mark Svancarek Nitin Walia Sarmad Hussain John Levine Samantha Mancia Nicolas Fiumarelli

#### **Agenda**

- 1) Welcome and roll call
- 2) Continue work on self-certification guide
- 3) AOB

# **Meeting Notes**

Work continued on the EAI self-certification guide. The group noted and addressed the comments from John Levine:

## EAI Mail Submission Agent (MSA)

- Line 2: "EAI values in address book display address local part as Unicode"
  - It was noted that one needs 8BITMIME to handle unencoded UTF-8 headers, and a suggestion was made to delete this
  - A decision was made to delete the note "MIME is related to mail body and attachhments
     (?) and is therefore crucial to an EAI user experience but is orthogonal to EAI RFIs"
  - It was noted that in practice it is common to use A-labels and not U-labels, so although it's important to accept both, it shouldn't be required to use U-labels

#### EAI-Mail User Agent (MUA)

- Line 17: "SMTP server address can be specified by A-label"
  - o It was noted that it would be better to say "submission" instead of "SMTP" per RFC 6409
- Line 26: "Unicode header values are not encoded with MIME encoded-words"
  - It was noted that this doesn't really matter in practice, what matters is that the MUA can handle unencoded UTF-8 in messages from other people
  - A decision was made to strike this line
- Line 31: "SMTPUTF8 parameter is provided with MAIL command for EAI messages"
  - It was noted that if you don't use the parameter then the server will reject it. This is essential.



- A decision was made to categorize this as SILVER
- Line 38: "Domain part of EAI values in atoms are displayed as Unicode"
  - It was noted that it's much more useful to display headers as they actually are. People
    who write email software say when they reencode it, it confuses people. The received
    headers are not normally displayed.
  - A suggestion was made to fix the explanatory text.
    - A decision was made to change "received" to "in reply to"

#### **IMAP**

- Line 11: "Mailbox with Unicode name can be created"
  - It was noted that any IMAP server can handle Unicode legacy encodings. If Unicode, makes sense, this test could be passed even if the email server could not handle the extensions.
  - A suggestion was made to note that you can pass the test even if you're not using a new
     FΔI feature
  - In answer to the question: "Is this about "creating" mailboxes (as in hosting them) or about listing and subscribing?"
    - It was noted that it is about creating EAI mail boxes.
  - A decision was made to add the annotation: "2 ways to pass legacy IMAP (SILVER) defined in RFC 6857 or EAI IMAP (GOLD) defined in RFC 6855"
- Lines 9 and 10: "SEARCH command does not specify charset" and "APPEND command uses UTF8
  extension"
  - Same as above
  - A decision was made to categorize these as GOLD
- Line 13: "Unicode mailbox names display as Unicode"
  - A decision was made to categorize this as SILVER
- Line 18: "Messages can be stored in mailbox with Unicode name"
  - It was noted that "mailbox" is what is usually referred to as "folders" in IMAP speak
  - A decision was made to add a note: "IMAP 'mailboxes' might be representated as 'folders' in other contexts"
  - A decision was made to categorize this as SILVER
- Lines 21 and 22: "Message with Unicode value in unstructured text header can be stored" and "Server address can be specified by A-label"
  - It was noted that these refer to submission, and that they represent a quality of implementation issue.
  - A decision was made to change both to GOLD with a note being added that it would create a terrible user experience if not implemented.
- Line 24: "Server address displayed as Unicode"
  - o It was noted that POP only lets you look in the main inbox (no fodlers).
    - This is a practical issue POP servers without UTF8 usually retrieve EAI emails perfectly well.
  - A decision was made to change lines 31-33 to SILVER, and lines 24 30 to GOLD



# Mail Transfer Agent (MTA)

- A question was posed on whether the MTA and MSA sections should be combined
  - o A decision was made to not combine them based on testing performed to date
- Line 7: "EAI reverse path values are transmitted to SMTPUTF8 server"
  - Question: Is this duplicative to the requirement of MTA; are they distinct or clumped together? Aren't they always bundled together?
    - It was determined that this only applies to an MSA that's separate from an MTA
    - Same for lines 8-13, they are only relevant if the MSA is separate from the MTA
- Something worth thinking about since you normally have to login to the MSA it would be useful to test whether the MSA allows non-ASCII passwords
  - o A decision was made to add a row for the above
  - A decision was made to break lines 7-13 out into a separate table so that they are distinct

# Mail Delivery Agent (MDA)

- Line 1: "Trace information includes domain in U-label form"
  - o It was noted that the people who write the software say it's not going to happen
  - A decision was made to categorize this as GOLD
  - For the question of the use of "Must" vs. "Should", it was decided to just say "does encode"
     vs. "doesn't encode" for clarity
- Line 2: "Trace information indicates SMTPUTF8 protocol"
  - A decision was made to categorize this as SILVER
- Line 3, 4 and 5: "Message with EAI address in originator header is delivered", "Message with EAI
  address in destination address header is delivered" and "Message with Unicode value in
  unstructured header is delivered"
  - It was noted that these are not optional
  - A decision was made to categorize them as SILVER
- Line 6: "Message is delivered to EAI address"
  - It was noted that this will deliver to other EAI addresses but doesn't have its own EAI addresses
  - o It was noted that the explanation text is not very clear
    - "Can you deliver to a local EAI mailbox?" should be the test
    - A decision was made to fix the left column to say "local EAI mailbox"
  - A decision was made to categorize this as GOLD
- Line 7: "Unicode username is accepted via IMAP"
  - o A decision was made to categorize this as GOLD per discussion above
- Line 8: "IMAP UTF8=ACCEPT or UTF8=ONLY capability is advertised"
  - o It was noted that EAI extensions are nice to have but one can get a lot done without them
  - A decision was made to categorize this as GOLD
- Line 9: "IMAP AUTHENTICATE command is supported"
  - It was noted that this is an example of theory vs. practice
    - In reality everyone does make LOGIN accept UTF8



- o An action item was assigned for John to revise the language in order to make it more clear
- o A decision was made to categorize this as SILVER
- Line 10: "IMAP ENABLE UTF8=ACCEPT command is accepted"
  - A decision was made to categorize this as GOLD
    - It was noted that if one doesn't do it, they use the legacy character support which works pretty well
- Line 11: "IMAP SEARCH command with CHARSET specification is rejected"
  - A decision was made to categorize this as GOLD
- Line 12: "IMAP APPEND UTF8 command is accepted"
  - o It was noted that this represents a new way to do it, but old way still works
  - A decision was made to categorize this as GOLD
- Line 13: "IMAP APPEND UTF8 preserves Unicode header values"
  - A suggestion was made to rephrase the text in left column to remove "UTF8" and to remove the text in right column "once EAI extensions have been enabled"
  - A decision was made to categorize this as SILVER
- Lines 13 19 should be broken into a different section for SILVER/GOLD
  - o An action item was assigned to John to check the legacy report
  - The group will return to this next week

# General Feedback on the Self-Certification Guide

- It was questioned whether the word "process" could be changed to "receive"
  - o It was explained that this has to do with the 5 UA verbs
  - A decision was made to define the word "process" in the document in order to provide clarity

Next meeting: Tuesday, 20 July 2021 at 1530 UTC

# **Action items**

No.	Action Item	Owner
1	Check the legacy report and provide feedback for the Self-Certification	John
	Guide in the MDA section, lines 13-19	Levine
2	Review language in the Self-Certification Guide in the MDA section, line 9	John
	and provide suggestions for how to make it more clear	Levine