

UA EAI WG Meeting

20 December 2022

Attendees

Mark Svancarek
Abdalmonem Galila
Jim DeLaHunt
Harsha Wijayawardhana
Olivier Kouami
Jessica Dadzie Asare

Hanan Khatib
Mohammed Awal
Amina Ramallan
Arnt Gulbrandsen
Yin May Oo

Agenda

1. Welcome and roll call
2. Complete the EAI [self-certification guide](#) by resolving comments (95% completed)
3. Determine and summarize what actions are required for each self-certification item **At a high level which things can be automated and which things are to be done manually (MUA1-6, IMAP and MSA completed)**
4. Complete the [score generator spreadsheet](#) (to be done offline)
5. Finalize the flowchart diagram
6. Identify the vendor's roles, and WG's roles are for the EAI self certification
 1. Go through the manual test run first, and see which parts are scriptable or automatable, and determine the amount of work, and calculate which tasks require manual work time.
 2. Update the [Statement of Work \(SOW\)](#) for E1.1 and E1.2
2. Email provider stories - User acceptance tests

[Meeting Recording](#)

Meeting Notes

Seda began the meeting with greetings. This was the last meeting of 2022. This meeting mainly focused on the agenda item2.

Agenda #2 Completing the EAI Self-certification guide

Mark said agenda #3 could also be discussed if the time allows.

Mark began by going through the document and resolving the comments in the document.

- First comment in the document started with Jim's comment: *"A requirement for Platinum level is "All integrated tools or utilities should be EAI enabled as well". Do we need to explain the consequences of that requirement in this section?"*

Abdalmonem supported this, and the issue was resolved.

- The next comment was from John: *"This example is wrong. Legacy IMAP supports Unicode, but the EAI extensions do it in a simpler way."*

To resolve this, Mark added "EAI Extensions" wording on page4.

- Mark's comment: "Examples should include pointers to the specific line items in the tables below, e.g. p. 9, Table "Software supports POP and/or IMAP", 12 "Unicode mailbox names can be accessed""

Jim DeLaHunt referred to Page 3, definition of "Platinum" level, "6. All integrated tools or utilities should be EAI enabled as well". He asked whether this is sufficient, or should we say more? If we want to say more, then page 4 is probably the place to say it.

Harsha questioned this from Dovecote's perspective. He pointed out that there is access to Unicode mailbox names, right now ".org" does not support. He asked if there are other platforms supporting Unicode mailbox names on IMAP servers. Arnt answered it is not there yet, but they are working on it. Mark requested Harsha to save assigning scores to the real-world systems for the later part, and continue reviewing the document.

As per Harsha's question on how the evaluation is done, whether scoring for each component, or overall, Mark demonstrated the score generator tool about how it works. Harsha asked that since different systems would have different components, there would be missing components and how would the overall score be defined. Mark said in the spreadsheet, there are different tabs for each component, the score card would be generated with which component scores which level. For example, a system may have an overall 'platinum' score with no IMAP component, but everything else is UA-best-ready and they might score 'platinum'. We need to figure out how to score a system if a system only has tools and utilities without mail components. Mark asked whether to leave the comment unresolved.

Jim continued explaining why we need more clarification in the document where he commented. Jim added a new comment on page 4 about defining how the

guide provides the score, and suggested adding evaluation as per component level, and the overall score is specifically based on the lowest rating component.

Jim said that the spreadsheet may not be clear enough because the score generator is not normative. It would be better to say the formulas of the accompanying spreadsheet are also part of this specification. Jim said there is a need to express the relationship of formulas in the spreadsheet to this, and then put words in this guide. So, we should not refer to the generator from the guide, as the generator is also part of the guide.

Mark said we might also need to say something in the spreadsheet to express the relationship with the document. He asked comments where we need to iterate it, whether on the guide or on the generator. It was harder to do it in the guide, and that's why we haven't done it here. Jim said it is expected to be iterating back and forth between the spreadsheet and the guide, as we rate the first few systems, more tweaking could happen. Jim preferred writing in the guide document. It is okay to leave some comments unresolved to remind us of unclear areas.

To address this, Mark added a new comment to EAI readiness levels on page 3: "NOTE: If this statement is unclear, we expect to clarify it iteratively as the first systems are certified and as subsequent versions of the scoring spreadsheet are developed."

Mark also added a comment in the 'EAI readiness levels' table, platinum section. Jim agreed. Abdalmonem said the term 'EAI-enabled' is confusing and Mark updated this sentence as "*All integrated tools or utilities should be UA-ready and EAI enabled as well*".

- Sub Header: "***Rating of system based on rating of components***"

Mark said we can let ourselves be more flexible and change more later. Mark discussed another comment about a system which has a mix of high-rating components and low-rating components. Mark asked some examples we can think of. Arnt said Gmail is a good example. Mark said if we do not cover enough for what to do with low-rating or no-rating components yet, it would be better to take them out of this document first, and then add later after we have found out what to do. Jim suggested taking it out of the document and leaving it as the comment part.

Arnt confirmed that the sentences on page 4 (first 2 paragraphs) for this topic are good enough. Jim and Harsha suggested that we may add what we mean by

“system”, as a collection of components and functionalities. Arnt said the document assumed that the system being tested has certain components which may not always be the case. Arnt suggested deleting the example as it was wrong for this context. Harsha said different applications may have separate structures or components and the document should have a testing partner.

All the ambiguities were removed on page 4, and hence Jim’s comment was also resolved.

Olivier asked what's the difference between EAI ready and EAI-enabled that was mentioned on the EAI readiness levels table. Mark said that UA ready is outside of this document. Jim will add the terms “UA-ready” and “EAI-enabled” to the glossary.

- Sub header: **“Email system components”**

Regarding the comment on page 5 that says “Do not make test cases with mixed directionality unless the tester is very familiar with the language/script of the test case”, we addressed it by adding a paragraph under other recommendations section on page4.

Mark said there has already been a discussion about which test case could be automated, and we found that most cases need manual, so the comments could be resolved. There were a few comments about handling mixed-directional test cases, Arnt suggested to express the concerns in the introduction or preface. Mark added to the ‘Other recommendations’ section in page 4.

- Mark read out a comment *“Text which combines left-to-right and right-to-left characters can be confusing for someone who does not know both writing systems. Do not make test cases with mixed directionality unless the tester is very familiar with the language(s)/script(s) of the test case and is able to interpret the test results appropriately.”*

Jim said we may want to do some mixed directional test cases, so we should not recommend avoiding it yet. And Mark added this to the same section.

- John’s comment on MUA8: “I don;t understand what this means. A-labels, which I am guessing are what you mean by punycode, are ordinary domain names. Any ASCII search would find them. This comment applies to all the places you mention "punycode".”

Arnt explained what John meant in this comment. Then MUA8 was edited. Abdalmonem added that A-label is only for domain names and not appropriate for mailbox names. So, Mark edited in the document that “Unicode for local parts and U-label and A-label for domain name parts.

Jim tried to clarify the difference between MUA7 (gold requirement) and MUA8 (platinum requirement). He said that it sounded like MUA8 allows the searching. Jim mentioned in the chat - *“There are 10 instances of the notation “<Email> Use Cases”*. It may originate from John Levine’s test scripts.”

Arnt said address books and interfaces should prioritize Unicode and U-labels to A-labels : “People should be able to not know that A-labels exist.” Mark agreed that his address book only has U-labels.

Jim said MUA7 is more about searching in Unicode text (non-ASCII text) from anywhere in the address book, and MUA8 is not only searchable but also able to display the alternative U-label if it is saved in A-label. Arnt explained that MUA7 is about address book support searching in Unicode, and MUA8 is about support searching in Unicode and the result includes A-label data as well.

Jim said we missed what we originally had for MUA8 and therefore, we opened a sub item under MUA8.

MUA8a was written as “Address book search finds U-Labels when search text is in A-Label form, and vice versa”.

MUA8b was written as “Address book entry creation supports Unicode even if the email address was generated from a message using A-Labels”

Jim commented in the chat: *“There are 10 instances of the notation “<Email> Use Cases”*. It may originate from John Levine’s test scripts.”

The meeting is concluded. In the next meeting we will continue from MUA8.

Mark said that he can make the next meeting 30 min earlier on 10th Jan. All agreed.

Next Meeting: Tuesday 10th Jan 2023 at 15:00 UTC

Action items

No.	Action Item	Owner
1	Add the terms "UA-ready" and "EAI-enabled" to the glossary	Jim