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Abstract

The specification for enhanced mail system status codes, RFC 3463, establishes a new code model and lists a collection of codes. While it anticipated that more codes would be added over time, it did not provide an explicit mechanism for registering and tracking those codes. This document specifies an IANA registry for enhanced mail system status codes, initializing that registry with the codes so far established in published standards-track documents.
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1. Introduction

The specification for enhanced mail system status codes, RFC 3463 [1], establishes a new code model and lists a collection of codes. While it anticipated that more codes would be added over time (see its Section 2), it did not provide an explicit mechanism for registering and tracking those codes. This document specifies an IANA registry for enhanced mail system status codes, initializing that registry with the codes so far established in published standards-track documents.

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in RFC 2119 [2].

1.1. Note in Draft

RFC Editor: please remove this section before publication.

This document is based on the recommendations of the working draft about IANA considerations [6] rather than the published, but somewhat dated, version [7]. Should it complete Last Call before there is action on the I-D, references to the published form will be retrofitted.

2. A New Registry

2.1. Registry Name

This registry will be known as "SMTP Enhanced Status Codes"

2.2. Information Required

A registration will consider of four items:

1. A numeric code, consisting of three components, as specified in RFC 3463.

2. Text expected to be associated with the code, as specified in RFC 3463.

3. A short description of the code, including the basic reply code of RFC 2821 [3] with which it is associated.

4. A reference to the document in which the code is defined. This reference should note whether the relevant specification is standards-track or not.
5. The identity of the submitter or registrant ("IESG" in the case of IETF-produced documents).

2.3. Review Process for New Values

Entries in this registry are expected to follow the "Specification Required", model although, in practice, most entries are expected to derive from standards-track documents. However, any review process for non-standards-track documents SHOULD accept evidence of significant deployment as a persuasive argument that the registration should be permitted: the principal purpose of this registry is ultimately to avoid confusion and conflicts among different definitions or uses for the same code.

2.4. Registration Updates

Standards-track registrations may be updated if the relevant standards are updated, and as a consequence of that action. Other registration entries may be updated with regard to short descriptions and references at the request of the party requesting the original registration but not with regard to the code or associated text. In exceptional cases, any registered entity may be updated at the direction of the IESG.

3. Initial Values

As discussed above, a registry should be created for extended SMTP reply codes. That registry should initially be populated with the codes specified in RFC 3463 [1], RFC 3886 [4], and updated as specified above. Documents presently in IESG evaluation or the RFC editor queue which update RFC 3463 can also provide initial values for this registry or should be used as a basis for updating it when they are approved and published.

4. Acknowledgements

While the need for this registry should have become clear shortly after RFC 3463 was approved, the growth of the code table through additional documents and work done as part of email internationalization and RFC 2821 updating efforts made the requirement much more clear. The comments of the participants in those efforts are gratefully acknowledged. Chris Newman provided useful comments and some text for a preliminary version of the document.
5.  IANA Considerations

This document specifies creation of a new registry and the initial values with which it is to be populated.

6.  Security Considerations

Many proposed additions to the response code list are security related. Having these registered in one place to prevent collisions will improve their value. Security error responses can leak information to active attackers (e.g., the distinction between "user not found" and "bad password" during authentication). Documents defining security error codes should make it clear when this is the case so SMTP server software subject to such threats can provide appropriate controls to restrict exposure.
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