

## Re: [fw-wiz] Evolution of Firewalls

**Source:** <http://www.derkeiler.com/Mailing-Lists/Firewall-Wizards/2004-03/0079.html>

---

**From:** Marcus J. Ranum ([mjr\\_at\\_ranum.com](mailto:mjr_at_ranum.com))

**Date:** 03/18/04

To: [ark@eltex.net](mailto:ark@eltex.net)

Date: Thu, 18 Mar 2004 09:34:44 -0500

Arkanoid wrote:

>*Slightly OT, anyone aware of WHICH protocol subset do email clients  
>use when doing IMAP4? I am still planning to implement a proxy, and RFC  
>requires all servers to support the whole fscking pile of s\*\*t!  
>(still tring to imagine that terrible brain damage that may lead  
>protocol designers to such an idiotic requirement)*

I haven't looked at it, so I can't help you there. But the "methodology" (it doesn't deserve the term...) I used to use is pretty straightforward. I'd write the main loop that handles the I/O on the command stream and then I'd put it inline with a couple of clients and implement the command set that the client used and stop when I had it working with a couple of clients. ;)

This worked surprisingly well, because I was able to "minimize" everything as I worked on it – whenever a command came through I'd ask myself "what the heck?" and figure out what it was supposed to do and then add whatever controls I could. Look for: buffer lengths, pathnames, execution commands, file operations, password lengths, username lengths, extra tokens on commands, line breaks, metacharacters where appropriate, etc. Then when you fire up a new client you'll periodically get something new that makes the proxy get upset – that's how you know it's working. :)

Ignore the RFCs. Remember: they're part of the problem, not a definition of the solution. I'd go so far as to say that a proxy is \*inherently\* a violation of the RFCs – if it's done right. ;)

mjr.

---

firewall-wizards mailing list  
[firewall-wizards@honor.icsalabs.com](mailto:firewall-wizards@honor.icsalabs.com)  
<http://honor.icsalabs.com/mailman/listinfo/firewall-wizards>