

RFC 2821bis issues list

Note: ??? Implies "issue may still be open even though text has changed" or, with the stuff assigned to Ned "waiting"... cref is also marked ???

-03 Issue#	-02 Issue#	-01 Issue#	Description
closed	closed		0a Remove "ignorant" from 7.1
closed	closed		0b MAIL FROM validation and EHLO validity tests
closed	1		1 Format of domain - trailing period
2	2		2 Check VRFY/EXPN text in Section 3.5.3
closed?	3		3 EHLO validation in sect 4.1.4, para 6
closed	closed		4 Sect 4.2.1 (Reply Codes 4yz 5yz) "encouraged" -> SHOULD
5	5		5 Sect 4.4. Syntax of ID in trace
closed	closed		6 Precedence error -- ABNF technical problem w/ grouping
7	7		7 Switch conformity language to 2119 form
closed	8		8 Number of recipients/ number of transactions per connection
closed	closed		9 Table of requirements and/or index and/or more items as sections.

10	10	10 Add discussion of mail rerouting via 251/551 to Security Considerations
closed	closed	11 Change instances of "A RR" to language that is IPv6-inclusive)
closed	closed	12 IPv6 issues with MX records
closed	closed	13 Syntax for parameters that contain email addresses.
closed	closed	14 Continuation lines for 220 Greeting?
closed	closed	15 Syntax change for reply lines to allow for continuation?
closed?	16	16 General use of "is permitted", etc
closed	closed	17 Should text be clarified to single code in continuations
closed	closed	18 Should text be clarified to prohibit 1yz codes without extensions
19	19	19 Comments on literals in EHLO - remove either "Explained-literal" or the text in 4.1.1.1 that describes it.
20	20	20 RFC3552 and Security Considerations
21	21	--- Bounce / reject improvements in section 6.2
22	22	--- May->Should, Should-> Must changes for return-paths in 4.4
23	23	--- Section 2.3.11 now defines "reply". Should there be a specific, numbered, definition for "command"? If so, text welcome.

24	24	--- Revise all ABNF to make a closed system starting with a definition for "command" or "command-verb"
25	25	--- Change all text that implies non-delivery messages to prohibit them entirely or permit them only with source authentication.
closed?	26	--- Revise description of reverse-paths to prevent repeated citations of "server adds its own..."
closed?	27	--- Straighten out and define terminology for talking about headers
closed?	28	--- Client behavior with unrecognized code
30	30	--- Should source route text be removed entirely and systems prohibited from paying attention to them?
31	---	--- Retain or drop new (03) FTP comparison text?
32	----	--- Is requirement in section 2.1 that server accept responsibility for messages appropriately stated as MUST?
33	---	--- Change "client" and "server" terminology back to original or to something else.