

Re: [Full-disclosure] What makes Yahoo! a good merger candidate?

## Re: [Full-disclosure] What makes Yahoo! a good merger candidate?

---

*Source:* <http://www.derkeiler.com/Mailing-Lists/Full-Disclosure/2008-02/msg00102.html>

---

- *From:* Chris 'Chipper' Chiapusio <[chipper@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:chipper@xxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Thu, 7 Feb 2008 10:31:25 -0500
- 

On Wed, Feb 06, 2008 at 11:40:06AM -0600, Paul Schmehl wrote:

They're also the first mail server I've ever connected to that won't accept user@xxxxxxxxxx and insists on <user@xxxxxxxxxx> instead. So, I'm not surprised to find that they 250 everything you type in.

I guess RFCs are even more meaningless now than they always have been. :-(

Please review <http://www.faqs.org/rfcs/rfc2821.html> to fully understand a modern SMTP transaction, I've included the appropriate excerpts for this thread:

### 3.3 Mail Transactions

[...]

The first step in the procedure is the MAIL command.

```
MAIL FROM:<reverse-path> [SP <mail-parameters> ] <CRLF>
```

This command tells the SMTP-receiver that a new mail transaction is starting and to reset all its state tables and buffers, including any recipients or mail data. The <reverse-path> portion of the first or only argument contains the source mailbox (between "<" and ">" brackets), which can be used to report errors (see section 4.2 for a discussion of error reporting).

[...]

However, in practice, some servers do not perform recipient verification until after the message text is received. These servers SHOULD treat a failure for one or more recipients as a "subsequent failure" and return a mail message as discussed in section 6. Using a "550 mailbox not found" (or equivalent) reply code after the data are accepted makes it difficult or impossible for the client to determine which recipients failed.

Tell us again how Yahoo is not adhering to the RFCs. While quoting RFC's to

Re: [Full-disclosure] What makes Yahoo! a good merger candidate?

Re: [Full-disclosure] What makes Yahoo! a good merger candidate?

this list is fairly lo-tech, people really should check fact before making a blatantly foolish statement about one of the largest email providers in the world. Strict adherence to RFC is the first and simplest step in fighting spam.

Who knew.

Indee