

UA EAI WG Meeting

31 January 2023

Attendees

Mark Svancarek

Nitin Walia

Jim DeLaHunt

Sushanta Sinha

Abdalmonem Galila

Athanese Bahizire

Malick A.

Nicolas Fiumarelli

Umut Pajaro Velasquez

Arnt Gulbrandsen

Yin May Oo

Agenda

1. Welcome and roll call
2. ICANN76 EAI Self Certification Meeting
3. **Complete the EAI [self-certification guide](#) by resolving comments (continue from MUA.18) - (95% completed) (What is the clear ask for the email providers?)**
<https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/ua-eai/2022-December/001741.html>
4. 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)***
5. Complete the [score generator spreadsheet](#) (to be done offline)
6. Finalize the flowchart diagram
7. 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
8. Email provider stories - User acceptance tests

[Meeting recording](#)

Meeting Notes

There was a matter to address to Jim's email and Mark will follow up with the thread after the meeting. The email from Jim is in the Appendix.

Section 5 MTA

Mark started to lead the meeting by discussing the comments of the EAI self-certificating guide. Mark asked Arnt to re-evaluate the appropriateness of the terms in the document, such as legacy, globally inclusive, limited latin and so on.

Arnt explained the second comment on the requirement of utf-8 to display email addresses, Gmail for example. Arnt suggested editing the text to "correspondent services and correspondent email addresses". Arnt suggested changing "other systems" to "correspondent systems".

Abdalmonem asked to clarify the requirements of Silver, Gold and Platinum levels. He pointed out about MTA.1 "SMTPUTF8 capability is advertised" which means it is expected to handle emails containing the utf-8 characters including the header. Abdalmonem and Jim suggested the text be changed in MTA.2 to "ability to correspond with remote internationalized email addresses."

MTA.6 : Anonymous comment said : *"check RFC whether a Received header with protocol is required. if Yes, then this is Silver; if optional, this is gold."*

John Levine already answered "Yes, it is required" and the comment was resolved with no changes in text.

MTA.12 : Jim's comment said : *"SMTPUTF8 parameter is not provided. Verify the RFC - Is this required?"* John Levine answered : *"Yes, this is required. Otherwise you'll be sending EAI messages into the void with no error reports."* The comment was resolved with no changes in text.

MTA.13 : Anonymous comment said : *"Verify with John Levine or RFC - see alternative proposed text in 'redline' above."* Jim explained that the 'redline' referred to the edit which was in June 2022. The text was already edited, thus, the comment was resolved with no changes in text.

Section 6 MDA

Mark suggested Jim to continue the explanation since the email sent by Jim was regarding this section.

Jim said this is based on the support for IDNA2008 vs IDA2003 which has to do with how the U-labels are converted into A-labels, involving the 4 deviation characters which will be handled differently. We want to support IDNA2008.

MTA 14, 15, 16, 17 would be a place to put that in. The best way to deal with this is to go up and look at MSA 17 through 20, and see if we like those, and if we do, we can make a decision about it if we want to add those to MTA as well.

Regarding the email to the WG (MSA section)

Jim explains that IDNA2008 is definitely preferable when converting the new labels, however, some major email servers still are still working with IDNA2003 and it would look foolish not to give them at least the Silver level, thus, IDNA2003 was grudgingly accepted as the lowest level requirement. Jim suggested putting this reasoning in MTA.14, MTA.15, MTA.16, and MTA.17. Jim suggested looking at MSA.18 through MSA.21 and synchronizing with MTA points. Mark approved Jim's suggestions in the MSA.18. Arnt suggested adding the text "future revision of this guide is anticipated to accept only IDNA2008 to achieve Silver".

MSA.19 is the Platinum feature, eventually MSA.19 would be gone, and MSA.20 and MSA.21 are Silver. Mark accepted all Jim's suggestions in the MSA section. Jim volunteered to edit MTA.9 and MTA.10 to be aligned with the recent edits of MSA.

MDA section

Jim and Mark discuss dividing the table into three parts, and MDA.1 - MDA.7 would apply to MDAs which also support IMAP. MDA.30 - MDA.37 would apply to MDAs which also support POP.

MDA.1 is a Gold feature. The verb 'creating' was not well explained, but we do have a concept of things that can be done with great effort or can be done by default. The things that can be done automatically or are default should have higher ratings. If the mail server was capable of doing it but you had to look into three layers of setting boxes and read two manuals, that would be Gold. And if it was right out of the box, it would be platinum. Nitin suggests that the user may need to create the EAI mailbox manually or automatically. Depending on the difficulty level, the system can be rated Gold or Platinum. Mark agreed with Nitin and MDA.1 and MDA.1b would be for these purposes. Nitin explained his concern that MDA.1 and MDA.1b are mutually exclusive, whereas the software will pass only one to these two criteria, by sharing his team's experience.



Universal Acceptance

MDA.11

There was a comment which said “*Check the RFC for consequences*”. The text in question [*Otherwise use legacy character support*] was removed.

MDA.13 and MDA.14

Arnt said these two items seemed equivalent. Jim commented that “*Compare MDA.13 and MDA.14 to IMAP.9 and IMAP.10 . Both discuss APPEND and use of UTF-8*”. Mark helped decide that the guide needs both perspectives.

MDA.15, MDA.16, MDA.17, ... MDA.23

Mark edited the description text to be more clear. This item could be splitted just like MDA.1 and MDA.1b, Mark asked everyone for opinion and Nitin said default is more dominant. Mark decided to leave it without splitting. Jim and Mark parallely edited the table.

7) Mail Service Provider (MSP)

Mark edited the description text and went through the MSP items. Minor edit suggestions were accepted accordingly.

Self-Certification of EAI Support of Email Utilities and Tools

There are incompletely written sections beyond this point. This guideline may be waiting for more inputs. Arnt is to find out more information on identifying the softwares.

Going through the Self-certification guide and resolving comments was done for the first round.

Next week, the working group will start looking into the “EAI communication and messaging” section.

Jim suggested that reviewing the Self-Certification Guideline is one thing, at the same time, running this through an actual software or email service would give a better understanding and properly compiled guideline.

Mark continued having a quick look at the Appendix section and resolving comments. The glossary would be reviewed in the next week as well.

Next Meeting: Tuesday 7th Feb 2023 at 15:30 UTC

Action items

No.	Action Item	Owner
1	Follow up with Jim's email to EAI WG offline	Mark
2	Re-organize the MDA table	Jim
3	Email to the mailing list and have a look at some softwares which this applies	Arnt
4	Update the glossary, terms would be in the glossary and normative standards would be in the reference section.	Jim
5		

Appendix

Email From Jim:

UA-EAI colleagues:

I have added some proposed tests to the EAI Self-Certification Guide to check for support of IDNA 2008. See:

Proposed edit to MUA.8a

Proposed edit to MUA.19

Proposed edit to IMAP.2

Proposed edit to POP.2

Proposed new tests MSA.17 - MSA.20

We should maybe have MTA tests similar to MSA.17 - MSA.20, but I have not drafted those

There are also some editorial suggestions to:

MUA.35

MSA.7-MSA.9

We can look at these as part of our review of the Self-Certification Guide, but it will require backtracking to earlier in the document.

—Jim