

UA EAI WG Meeting

26 July 2022

Attendees

Mark Svancarek
Nitin Walia
Jim DeLaHunt
Hored Sossou
Seda Akbulut

Agenda

- 1) Welcome and roll call
- 2) Reviewing the [self-certification guide](#)
- 3) Next action items from FY23 Action Plan to work on
 - a) E1.1 is the priority
 - b) E3.1 and E3.2 will be done in parallel
- 4) AOB

Meeting Recording:

https://icann.zoom.us/rec/share/XdTdS-wPNvS0_SGHt-W88p3e-Q6qwV6QQRL16msVjR5saoAQPxp7xlxUhjcUrwxd.1n_ydeLeeUPeN4hL

Meeting Notes

Mark shared that the comments added on the self-certification guide after we asked some experts to look at the EAI questions. He stated that ideally all these questions should be reviewed by a technical expert. Currently it was reviewed by one person and the comments were not that promising. Most of these comments are not answering the questions, but asking for additional editorial context. Mark shared some of his comments with everyone. For further review some committed individuals are required.

Seda shared the draft action plan items and Mark started discussion on each item from top to bottom. Last discussion was done on E3.1. Mark shared that it is a two-stage task and E3.1 should be added in the document before sharing it for community feedback. We may consider continuing with E3.1.

Mark showed the new comments in the document. Mark read comments and shared that some of these are not correct due to misunderstanding of the statement. Here Mark exemplified our work to a waterfall mode, and not an agile process. Jim stated that we might have lost the opportunity to describe the process of making this document, an actual process.

Jim asked about the comments on technical questions. Seda shared those comments are in EAI guide document. Jim commented that one general process to handle this is to release the document for a wider community review as draft and keep it in draft for several months until someone is willing to go through it as a test subject. At least one or two providers should go through the certification guide and give us some ideas about how it worked. Technical expertise is needed to finalize the document. It cannot be declared final until tested. Mark agreed to it.

We have the option that an expert engineer does a pass on the questions. Abdalmonem was conscious of time, and he had suggested splitting in two parts by sharing with Nitin. It would be good if he can go through the document and share comments. We can also ask the vendor to look at the Github page John has for testing and align it with the self-certification guide.

Jim also nominated Abdalmonem Galila for this. Mark shared one more pass is required for the document. He shared some more nominations for this task. We want to release it without any caveats. Abdalmonem, Xgen and Mark have teams. We may also think of paying the experts for this task.

At this moment, Nitin shared that he has shared the technical questions document with his team. He did not share the entire guide. He stated that he is waiting for feedback, and it can be shared with Abdalmonem for more review. Seda mentioned that she shared with the Coordination WG already to get feedback from their teams.

Jim shared his fear that if it is reviewed by a lot of people which are not so technical then it will result in false feedback. Jim prefers someone to read the entire document all the way and share feedback. Mark agreed to that.

Seda shared the initial draft of the [SOW](#) for the work on “Build self-certification tool to generate scores and Support self-certification for EAI” that covers two items E1.1 and E1.2. Mark gave an overview of the document. Jim suggested rephrasing reference providers to early providers. Suggestion has been

incorporated in the SOW document. Based on the budget and complexity of the work, Jim recommended to support only one or two early adopters.

Nitin asked about the whole budget allocation to initial work only. Jim asked if he means that one provider should provide more than one reference. Mark shared that there is flexibility in utilizing budget for action items.

Jim thinks that we cannot build the tool without knowing if someone can really try the self-certification tool. Nitin shared a concern that if we limit it to two early providers, people may think this is only for the early providers.

Jim suggested developing another SOW for supporting further providers as they go through a self-certification process over the next year. Maybe contractors can bid on both contracts. Mark asked if they bid only on the first one. Jim shared that can be figured out later. First obstacle to overcome is to make a vendor self-certified. Nitin stated that a good approach will be to name it Phase 1 and Phase 2. Phase 2 can be started on the progress of Phase 1.

Nitin summarized it as that a contractor should bid on the whole project and the project can have 2 phases. According to progress of phase 1, phase 2 will be contracted and paid.

Mark mentioned that he is concerned in splitting the SOW into two in terms of the inconsistency. Jim added that the other contract focuses on more support rather than just the score generating tool.

Mark asked to group E1.1 and E1.2 in phases. Nitin shared that it will be more motivating for the contractor to participate. Seda shared the contractual complexity over here regarding SOW. Nitin shared that if phase 1 (E1.1) fails, there is nothing to be done for phase 2 (E1.2) and contracts need to be done again with someone else. So Nitin suggested splitting these two items in the same SOW. Jim added that the budget needs to be identified for each phase.

Mark asked about the legal side of having a contract in phases and in terms of pay out. He meant the task should be in a mentioned sequence. Everyone agreed that if milestones are not achieved, payments are not done. Jim shared a concern that if we have two providers both unsuccessful, then it means there is a problem in the document.

Mark shared a summary of milestones of the task so that it is easy to evaluate the progress. Jim agreed.

Mark shared the description of work to have a look through the lens of suggestions shared. The description and deliverables should talk more on the algorithm. It mentions the input and a method to generate reports. Jim shared that it is the vendor's responsibility to come up with an algorithm and provide a web portal for the email providers to have self-certification.

Jim mentioned that It would be bad if we build the tool then we cannot find any providers to use it. Therefore, we may start with providers at E3.

Mark and Jim started to edit the SOW's description. We will continue working on the SOW in the next meeting.

Next Meeting: Tuesday 2nd August 2022 UTC 1430 -1530

Action items

No.	Action Item	Owner