# UA EAI WG Meeting
16 August 2022

**Attendees**
Mark Svancarek
Nitin Walia
Jim DeLaHunt
Harsha Wijayawardhana
Amin Hacha
Gerardo Mtz Hdz ICANN74 Fellow
Seda Akbulut

**Agenda**

1. Welcome and roll call
2. ICANN75 Community Update EAI WG slides
3. Statement of Work (SOW) for E1.1 and E1.2
4. Next steps with the EAI self-certification guide
5. AOB

**Meeting Recording:**
https://icann.zoom.us/rec/share/TqhzMcgwJ1TSpE9CBFG_ykTbYJS3v_N5xszv5srO
D2Bvk0Df6IBTGZbEjgioXYEi.NJJTPpXiiGNsanc4

**Meeting Notes**
In this meeting, only agenda item no 2 was handled. The rest will be handled in the next meetings.

Some action items from the past meetings were discussed:
1) Harsha sent an email on 16 August to the EAI mailing list about RFC 6532. Mark thanked him. Harsha said that it looks like the issue comes from the operating systems. He will compile other findings and then send them to Mark Sv.
2) Shawn Steele will be away for a few weeks. Seda had sent two invites for the past and this meeting. As no response was received, she will send another invite for the future meetings.

**ICANN75 Slides:**

We went through all the slides first and then everyone shared their feedback. Seda stated that the Community update session will be on 8 Sep, the session will be online as it is a prep week session. However, the main week sessions will be held hybrid.

**Slide 23:** Instead of L1 and L2 terminology, Jim suggested using the new terminologies. ICANN75 would be a good place to start using these, **namely Silver, Gold, and Platinum.** Mark agreed to socializing the self certification guide and its terminologies.

**Slide 24:** EAI survey was conducted for the 1172 TLD zones covering 210 mio Second Level Domains, under which we identified 35 mio unique mail servers with 2.5 mio unique IP addresses. Each IP address we look at the MX records to find SMTPUTF8. Usual trend is 33 IP addresses never respond, 7,32% have EAI support, and the rest have no EAI support.

Mark stated this slide does not say much as there is no progress over the quarters and this was used in the previous meeting as well.

Seda noted that the figures reflect the result of the gTLDs only. One thing that is new in this slide is now we have posted a link on **github for ccTLDs so that they can also conduct the same survey for their zone files.**

**Slide 25:** Mark stated that the second bullet is misleading: "The guide provides scores (silver, gold, platinum) for individual features and could be the basis of the logo program."
Because when it says the self-certification tool generates scores, it sounds like we're saying we're going to test your system, whereas the reality is, you are going to send us your results, and we will tell you what your scores are.

Mark suggested changing this as **"build self-certification tool to generate scores from test results submitted by EAI providers**."

Jim suggested putting it as "**to compile scores based on test results**."

Mark noted that we need to make sure that the slides alone should not lead to a false conclusion.

For slide 25, Jim added that we're trying to create a product category and set up competition and positioning within that category. That's really the value of what the self certification guide is, and that's worth a top level mention.

**Slide 26:** This slide looks good. No revision was recommended.

**Slide 27:** The example given in the second paragraph is not so good. "e.g., the character set that needs to be allowed while validating a domain name field)." Instead of that, saying "**Don't use regex. If you do, make sure it is RFC compliant**." would be a better example.

**Mark suggested putting the third bullet to second.**

**Slide 28:** This is the continuation of the same work mentioned on slide 27. However, this slide includes some new updates.

With this last slide, Mark asked participants about the changes in the flow of the slides, and editorial changes that may be done.

Jim commented that the emphasis should be given to **the self certification guide and its implementation.**

Mark agreed but added that it is frustrating that we put so much time and volunteer effort, but still only at 95% level. Technical engagement, **EAI technical education** are other points we need to highlight. Mark asked all what the key takeaway would be for the audience.

Jim responded that the slides on the EAI survey do not say too much. Basic message it conveys is that adoption is flat and it's not improving at all.

For the EAI Survey results, one piece of data we could have there that would be interesting is **breakout servers** that are attached to globally inclusive domain names from those which are attached to ASCII-only domain names.

Jim added a comment for the EAI Technical Education slides that he does not recall whether we have mentioned it before that the work is continuing. Also asked whether it is possible for him to see the questions and answers so that he can post his answers to them.

Seda responded to Jim's questions that the work is ongoing, and it was mentioned in ICANN74. However, it was mentioned briefly. Now we have more updates on this work. The slide shows only four questions but in fact there are dozens of more questions posted with answers. The report on this work is in progress and is almost finished. In that report, we will have a call to action item where we want the community to review the answers and **upvote if they agree** so that we increase the visibility of EAI questions for the developers in those platforms.

Another update on this work is that the developer wrote two blogs on EAI and IDNs, of which the links are posted on different developers' forums so that the response does not come from an organization **but from a colleague.**
Mark suggested that the EAI survey result should be something to be reported on **Measurement WG.**

**Slide order:** Mark suggested putting slides in a sequence to explain our story, which starts with reminding people on EAI technical education, which is something we talked about in previous meetings, and soon we have a new report on technical engagement. Then we can go into what the group has been working on lately.
Mark asked whether he can access the data to make a pivot table for the EAI survey results for the **EAI/ ASCII-only distinction**.

Nitin reminded us of the **FY23 Action Plan** that has been finalized and we should talk about while addressing our ongoing works and the works in the pipeline.
Mark agreed with Nitin.

Seda clarified the details on EAI technical education might not be released yet on uasg.tech, but we can still provide the update on what the team is working on and what to expect in the near future, and where we need help from the community. She also added that one thing we can add to the slides would be a call for action on **volunteering to the User Acceptance Test (UAT**) for self-certification.

Jim also recommended to mention at ICANN75 that "EAI" terminology itself is an issue. Mark sympathized with this idea, however it is not necessarily widely used as we focus on the content more than the terminology.

Harsha mentioned that while checking the RFCs for Sinhala email addresses, he came across some issues with Thunderbird and Microsoft Outlook. Mark mentioned about the email tests that were generated by John Levine and posted

on github for which we had client testing. Then recommended the UASG021A, UASG28 and UASG030 documents posted on uasg.tech document hub.

Jim added in the chat that it is great to find out about bugs in Sinhalese support in email clients. Ideas for what to do with the information: 1. write an informal bug report and post to UA-EAI so that others know about it. 2. Tell ICANN about it via https://uasg.tech/global-support-center  3. File a bug report with the email vendor, e.g. for Thunderbird, https://wiki.mozilla.org/Thunderbird:Testing

As the ICANN75 slides need to be reviewed by other teams as well, it is agreed that Seda will share the inputs with Mark, and Mark will do his best in revising the slides based on these inputs.

**Next Meeting:** Tuesday 23$^{nd}$ August 2022 UTC 1430 -1530

**Action items**

| No. | Action Item | Owner |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | | |
| 2 | | |
| 3 | | |
| 4 | | |