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Objectives and Scope

- Controlling spam-like unwanted traffic
  - We target unsolicited asynchronous messages
  - These rely on content being read/heard by the receiver

- Two objectives
  1. Examine two protocol design choices
     - Sender-push vs. receiver-pull
  2. Study the feasibility of using receiver-pull for asynchronous message applications
Outline of the Talk

- Message delivery models and their variants
  - Sender-Push (SP)
  - Receiver-Intent-based Sender-Push (RISP)
  - Receiver-Pull (RP)
  - Sender-Intent-based Receiver-Pull (SIRP)

- A simple receiver-pull-based email delivery system
  - The Differentiated Mail Transfer Protocol (DMTP)

- Summary
Sender-Push (SP)

(a) Sender Push

- Examples: SMTP-based email, asynchronous voice messages

- Roles
  - S: Controls what content is delivered and when it is delivered
  - R: Passively receives the entire message before processing/discardng

- Responsibilities
  - S: Prepare and transmit message when ready
  - R: Has to wait, receive, process, store/discard each message.

- Accountability
  - Senders can vanish after pushing messages
Receiver-Intent-based Sender-Push (RISP)

- Examples:
  - Mailing lists, subscription-based stock/news ticker, instant messaging.

- Receiver can exercise minimal control over sender
  - Subscribe/unsubscribe
  - Whitelist/blacklist

- Basic problems for SP
  - Senders control what/when to send
  - Receiver must accept entire message.
  - Poor accountability
Receiver-Pull (RP)

Examples: HTTP and FTP

Roles
- S: Stores the message and passively waits for retrieval
- R: Controls if and when to retrieve the message

Responsibilities
- S: Prepare, store, manage the content and wait (stay online)
- R: Retrieve the message when convenient

Accountability
- Sender’s identity is visible for a larger window of time
Sender-intent-based Receiver Pull (SIRP)

- Example: Pager service

- Allow senders to express short intent to send a message
  - Content delivery is still controlled by receiver

- Primary advantages of RP
  - Receivers control delivery
  - Senders commit more resources
  - Senders can be held accountable
    - Senders cannot vanish before message is retrieved

- Disadvantage:
  - To some extent, intent notice may itself be considered as SPAM.
  - Definitely better than receiving the whole message.
SIRP Email Architecture

Issue: All messages, whether spam or legitimate, are affected by the two-step delivery
DMTP: Differentiated Mail Transfer Protocol

- Classify the senders
  - Allowed – regular contacts
  - Denied – well-known spammers
  - Unclassified – anyone not in allowed/denied

- Differentiate delivery of messages based on sender classification
  - Allowed: Directly accept the entire message
  - Denied: Directly decline the message before content is delivered.
  - Unclassified: Use the SIRP model to retrieve message

- Classification granularity at
  - MTA level and
  - (optionally) Email address level
If \((\text{SMTA is Denied})\)  
return 550 (PE)  
close TCP session  
else \((\text{SMTA is allowed})\)  
proceed using SMTP  
else /* \text{SMTA is unclassified} */  
accept MSID  
(reject any DATA command)  
/* pull message later if and when user wants */
Example DMTP transactions

SMTA: open TCP connection
RMTA: Get IP address of SMTA

// Case 1: SMTA IP is Allowed
RMTA: 220

// Case 2: SMTA IP is Denied
RMTA: 550
RMTA: close TCP connection

// Case 3: SMTA IP is Unclassified
RMTA: 220
SMTA: EHLO domain.com
RMTA: 220 MSID
SMTA: MAIL FROM: <yyy> DMTP
RMTA: 220
SMTA: RCPT TO: <xxx>
RMTA: 220
SMTA: MSID <identifier>
RMTA: 220

// if DATA command is attempted
SMTA: DATA
RMTA: 550
Other aspects

- **DMTP can be incrementally deployed**
  - No need to change everyone from SMTP ➔ DMTP overnight

- SIRP model is also applicable to mobile text messages, asynchronous voice message etc.

- Other references:
  - *Receiver-Driven Extensions to SMTP*, Internet Draft
  - *DiffMail: Controlling Spam Through Message Differentiation*, TR, FSU
  - *DiffMail Project webpage*:
    http://www.cs.fsu.edu/~duan/projects/diffmail/
Summary

- We examined two message delivery models and their variants
  - Receiver-pull model preferred in controlling unwanted messages

- Presented application of receiver-pull to email delivery
  - Differentiated Mail Transfer protocol (DMTP)
  - Currently implementing DMTP in Sendmail.
    (code to be available soon)

- Thank you!