

UA EAI WG Meeting

09 August 2022

Attendees

Mark Svancarek

Nitin Walia

Jim DeLaHunt

Harsha Wijayawardhana

Georgia Osborn

Sushanta Sinha

Mark Datysgeld

Sonigitu Ekpe

Seda Akbulut

Meeting Agenda:

- 1) Welcome and roll call
- 2) Reviewing the new comments on the self-certification guide
- 3) Statement of Work (SOW) for E1.1 and E1.2
- 4) The next action items in the FY23 Action Plan to be worked on:
 - a) E3.1 and E3.2 will be done in parallel
- 5) AOB

Meeting Recording:

<https://icann.zoom.us/rec/share/RW1csuaD-xXbH83bKomCsOeRcWm7Wdp3M9ID2CY0E0WNg1FKoKacgmbcujsdQqH.G9nn7ykusnJt1BvO>

Passcode: nf806y!n4m

Meeting Notes

Mark Sv. welcomed everyone and shared that we have been working on the self-certification guide for over a year. Mark Sv. contacted Shawn Steele. Seda followed up with him too as per the discussion in the last meeting. **Shawn knows the urgency of this topic and he's agreed to help us work on it.** However, he is

out of office right now. As soon as he is back to the office, we will invite him to the call again.

As per the action item from the last meeting, Nitin confirmed that he has added answers to the EAI questions document. Mark Sv. shared that early review showed that it has some technical ambiguities. He talked about the steps taken in order to resolve these ambiguities. Mark suggested going through the self-certification guideline quickly. Seda summarized the discussion that took place in the last meeting and Mark elaborated a little bit more about MIME. Mark Sv went through the document.

Mark Sv. shared that he would like to work on SOW today.

Mark Sv. moved on to the SOW document and shared the purpose of the work. Mark Sv. started going through the first part of the document. Mark Sv. clarified regarding the contents of E1.2 and E1.2 and told about the budget for both items.

Mark Sv. went through the description of work. He pointed out a few lines and said that they are confusing so we need to go through them again. Mark explained why keeping the number of attempts for scoring is not a good idea.

Sushanta shared his point of view regarding the number of attempts. Sometimes we use that data and in order not to allow the person to take the test with the same name. This is the usual reason why we count it, but it is not required here.

Mark Sv. added the point in the document for further review. Seda suggested that we should **avoid storing the local data**, but can record the timestamp and score in order to avoid GDPR issues, and also maybe clearly define that local data will not be captured or deleted. Mark Sv. said that we should have some sort of policy and what we are saving should be **at least anonymised**.

Mark Sv. started reviewing the FAQ part, and asked if there is any way to capture questions in advance. Should it be a work item that says here's a place for people to ask questions?

Seda shared that this is a living document that the vendor create on forseen the possible questions the email service providers can ask to utilize the tool and the guide. And then the vendor needs to add onto it as more questions are received.

Mark Sv. asked if we need functionality provided in this SOW for taking questions.

Jim shared that the early adopters will experience some issues applying this process and using this tool, so we should be capturing the problems they have and try to fix them. Jim suggested that SOW should have something regarding learning from the first couple of customers which will provide us with problems encountered by them. But the SOW is not the place for the FAQ work.

Jim shared in the chat that with only an initial couple of reference providers, the subjects of this system will not be very anonymous. Mark Sv. agreed.

Nitin asked **if we are looking for the contractor to make a tool, host at its own servers and manage for us.** Mark Sv. asked who should host this tool. Seda shared her point of view on using this on **uasg.tech** and noted that there should be clarification regarding the time during the support is provided and for how many users it is provided etc. It should not be open ended. She provided an example of providing 10 hours of support to x number of providers.

Mark Sv. added the suggestion to the document and shared a query. Mark Datysgeld said that these types of contracts are not flexible, and it establishes a cap. Seda added that it would be not practical to validate the number of hours spent for the providers. Mark shared that this hour based calculation is not budget friendly. Jim shared his concern and said bringing in the first few providers will be more like 100 hours not 10. Mark said that we will have to figure out how the support is provided. **Nitin raised a question on why to cap on hours. We can cap the number of providers.** Mark Sv. agreed as we can control to verify the number of providers. And we cannot verify the number of hours spent and what the level of service is provided.

Mark Sv. shared that this was proposed as two different work items, one was building the tool and the other was supporting a reference provider.

Mark said that we need to make sure that we are not paying for a broken tool. How can we verify the tool is working? To prevent that we have to do some user acceptance testing (**UAT**). It was asked who the user was going to be. Nitin responded with a solution, and shared that without the service provider's feedback we cannot validate the level of quality of the tool. Seda asked if anyone has a user in mind for conducting the user acceptance test, perhaps as a volunteer. In an emergency case, Nitin suggested **Xgen** can do the UAT if no one can do it, and Mark Sv. also added that he will see if there is a volunteer at **Microsoft**. It is agreed that we will ask volunteers from the **ua-discuss list** to do the UAT. Seda thanked Nitin and Mark Sv.

Mark Sv. started discussing point 2a and 2b and said that it is not the job of the vendor to make sure that the users actually succeed, and made some changes in the document. Mark Datysgeld asked a question and said that it is not the case that a contractor has to do 100% of this work. Mark Datysgeld suggested that **someone from ICANN org will be supporting this efforts permanently** and the support to be provided to the reference provider will be provided by a combination of this contractor and those ICANN resources. And asked Seda if there is such a possibility. Seda said that she would check this with the teams internally and added that ICANN org is hiring a person for the **UA Tech Manager** role, but there are already several tasks accumulated from the other working groups for this person, and we need to shortlist those with the UASG based on the priorities to create a bandwidth for this type of task.

Mark asked which action item is to identify the reference providers. Jim explained that the **initial reference providers should be enthusiastic enough to do the task with or without the support**. Jim suggested that a good approach could be that we focus on recruiting the first couple of providers. Only providers who are really committed to the idea of certification will invest the effort. So, we first find the enthusiastic reference provider, ask them to self-certify, provide email support from the community, but basically leave them to figure it out for themselves. Ask them to tell us how the process was, what kind of support would have helped, what kind of tool would have helped, what changes should the process have. Jim added that the initial provider comes up with a score through the spreadsheet they make with one line for each test item in our tool. Then there will be some judgment calls

where they see things that are not completely platinum and they say, we deserve a platinum anyway because of this reason. So it'll be a spreadsheet to keep track of results and human logic to integrate them all and come up with an overall rating.

Mark shared that **the first fundamental thing that the tool has to do is to provide all the tests explicitly**. Jim responded by saying that the document also provides that. Nitin said that the tool can be used to score the feedback provided by the service providers. He added that we cannot have a whole automated process in the given timeframe and budget. Jim added that a scoring tool does not add much value to an enthusiastic provider. We will know enough to be able to write this SOW once we hear the inputs from the early providers who self certify themselves.

Nitin suggested that this can also be done **through the UA Ambassadors**. He added that the contractor's priority will be creating the scoring tool, providing support to the services provider may not be needed. Mark Sv. agreed. Jim noted that scoring tool does not add much value to an enthusiastic provider. Because they will basically take a list of results and come up with an aggregate result based on all of the individual results. It's not that hard for humans to do judging.

Mark Sv added that this **tool can act as a tiebreaker as an objective tool**, in case of divergence between the provider's judgment and UASG's. (e.g., one thinks it is silver, other thinks gold)

Mark said that the product that we are producing should have value and how we can add value to this thing will be discussed in the next meeting. Mark thanked everyone for their time.

Next meeting: Tuesday 16th August 2022 UTC 1430 -1530

Action items

No	Action Item	Owner
1	When the self-certification guide is ready, invite the ua-discuss list (UA Ambassadors / /Local Initiatives) to self certify themselves for the User Acceptance Test.	Mark Sv.

2	Shawn Steele to be invited to the next meetings	Seda
----------	---	------