

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 ???

-04 Issue#	-03 Issue#	-02 Issue#	-01 Issue#	Description
closed	closed	closed		0a Remove "ignorant" from 7.1
closed	closed	closed		0b MAIL FROM validation and EHLO validity tests
closed	closed	1		1 Format of domain - trailing period
2 (text in 04 ok?)	2	2		2 Check VRFY/EXPN text in Section 3.5.3
closed	closed	3		3 EHLO validation in sect 4.1.4, para 6
closed	closed	closed		4 Sect 4.2.1 (Reply Codes 4yz 5yz) "encouraged" -> SHOULD
5	5	5		5 Sect 4.4. Syntax of ID in trace
closed	closed	closed		6 Precedence error -- ABNF technical problem w/ grouping
closed	closed	7		7 Switch conformity language to 2119 form
closed	closed	8		8 Number of recipients/ number of transactions per connection
closed	closed	closed		9 Table of requirements and/or index and/or more items as sections.

text ok?	10	10	10	Add discussion of mail rerouting via 251/551 to Security Considerations
closed	closed	closed	11	Change instances of "A RR" to language that is IPv6-inclusive)
closed	closed	closed	12	IPv6 issues with MX records
closed	closed	closed	13	Syntax for parameters that contain email addresses.
closed	closed	closed	14	Continuation lines for 220 Greeting?
closed	closed	closed	15	Syntax change for reply lines to allow for continuation?
closed	closed	16	16	General use of "is permitted", etc
closed	closed	closed	17	Should text be clarified to single code in continuations
closed	closed	closed	18	Should text be clarified to prohibit 1yz codes without extensions
closed	closed	19	19	Comments on literals in EHLO - remove either "Explained-literal" or the text in 4.1.1.1 that describes it.
closed	closed	20	20	RFC3552 and Security Considerations
closed	closed, collapse to 25	21	---	Bounce / reject improvements in section 6.2
closed	closed	22	---	May->Should, Should-> Must changes for return-paths in 4.4

23 (text in 04 ok?)	closed, but no text yet	23	---	Section 2.3.11 now defines "reply". Should there be a specific, numbered, definition for "command"? If so, text welcome.
24	24	24	---	Revise all ABNF to make a closed system starting with a definition for "command" or "command-verb"
25 (text in 04 ok?)	25	25	---	Change all text that implies non-delivery messages to prohibit them entirely or permit them only with source authentication.
closed	closed	26	---	Revise description of reverse-paths to prevent repeated citations of "server adds its own..."
closed	closed	27	---	Straighten out and define terminology for talking about headers
closed	closed	28	---	Client behavior with unrecognized code
closed	closed	30	---	Should source route text be removed entirely and systems prohibited from paying attention to them?
closed	31, closed, no further change	---	---	Retain or drop new (03) FTP comparison text?
closed	32 - closed, specifics in 32b	----	---	Is requirement in section 2.1 that server accept responsibility for messages appropriately stated as MUST?
32b (text in 04 ok?)	32b	---	---	Text to clarify issues with responsibility handoff and specifics of "properly reporting the failure"
closed	33, closed, no global action	---	---	Change "client" and "server" terminology back to original or to something else.
34	34	---	---	Replace non-2606 ("example.com", etc) domains
35 (04 text sufficient?)	35	---	---	Remove Source routes from example / appendix D.3

--- Add text to IANA section linking to the various parameter and clause registries