

UA EAI WG Meeting

28 February 2023

Attendees

Mark Svancarek

Nitin Walia

Jim DeLaHunt

Sushanta Sinha

Abdalmonem Galila

Abraham Fiifi Selby

Athanese Bahizire

Harsha Wijayawardhana

Olivier Kouami

Arnt Gulbrandsen

Seda Akbulut

Agenda

- 1 Welcome and roll call
- 2 **Review Thnic's question and feedback, plan the ICANN76 main week session and slide deck on EAI Certification Guide**
 - Q.1 Because we have not passed on IMAP.18 which is required for SILVER only one point. So it means that คน.ไทย not get SILVER tier right?
 - Q.2 We not enable POP service? Do we need to enable and test it or not since we not use?
 - Q.3 In the guide, should have example how to test in each point or in general.
 - Q.4 In my opinion, I think we should have a lower tier than silver, only focus on sending and receiving EAI email only to gain interest for email service providers. The guide should be easier for starter
- 3 **Plan the ICANN76 main week session and slide deck on EAI Self Certification Guide**
- 4 **Complete the EAI [self-certification guide](#) by resolving comments, and new edits by Jim**

(What is the clear ask for the email providers?)
<https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/ua-eai/2022-December/001741.html>
- 5 **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>

- 6 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)***
- 7 Complete the [score generator spreadsheet](#) (to be done offline)
- 8 Finalize the flowchart diagram
- 9 Identify the vendor's roles, and WG's roles are for the EAI self certification
 - Q.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.
 - Q.2 Update the [Statement of Work \(SOW\)](#) for E1.1 and E1.2
- 10 Email provider stories - User acceptance tests

Recording

Meeting Notes

Reviewing THNIC's questions and feedback

Mark started the meeting by reading out the four questions, and looked into the THNIC's results on the EAI self-certification guide of THNIC's copy. Mark went through the Guide with real-world test results to help everyone understand the flow.

- While the MUA section has some Gold and Silver items, THNIC supports all Silver and some Gold in this section.
- IMAP.9 failed, which is Gold. Nitin pointed out that this item is not really the IMAP issue, however, this would be left as it was for the time being.
- The test case to be focused is **IMAP.18** (Silver) whereas THNIC did not pass, and THNIC has already been supporting some other Gold-level requirements. The IMAP.18 requirement is "Messages can be stored in the mailbox with a unicode name". Abdalmonem suggested this could be Gold, since the mailboxes are not hosted automatically, the basic requirement is to be able to send, receive, save contacts and so on. Mark has some consistency concerns, however, Arnt said this may not be an essential requirement. Everyone agreed to change this level to Gold.
- Arnt asked to confirm if THNIC actually failed this test case and why, because this feature is not new and most interfaces made this work. Nitin

said THNIC actually does not support IMAP. Abdalmonem said the way of storing the mailbox name could cause the problem.

- Harsha briefly shared his user experience on testing email applications. IMAP does not seem to support UTF-8. Arnt said this problem is not related to THNIC failing IMAP.18, Mark said they might be looking at another thing.
- Mark suggested that in the description of IMAP.18, the mailbox should be renamed as 'IMAP folder'. Abdalmonem said since IMAP11 is Gold, IMAP18 should also be Gold. Arnt said IMAP.18 depends on the old IMAP which requires support of Unicode. If we are looking consistently at other requirements, it should be Gold.
- Mark concluded that we should ask what they actually tested. Meanwhile, we should decide if IMAP.18 is Silver or Gold, and WG preferred to make it Silver.

Question 2

The answer is : "No."

Jim explained that in the updated current version of the Self-certificating guide, it was explained that POP is not compulsory. Although they have the POP code base, they can disable it and say 'POP' is not supported.

Side note: If a feature is supported but not clearly documented or the steps to enable it are complicated, that would not be considered 'basic functionality'.

Question 4

Jim said he is interested in looking at their document, and Seda replied that the resultant document was not shared yet because it includes their own mail systems and test results. Jim suggested letting the working group take a look at it after filtering out the confidential information, and deal with the non-confidential feedback. Jim said he just wanted to check the document version to make sure THNIC tested using the guide which as the note about the POP is non-compulsory.

Jim suggested replying to THNIC showing the latest version of the POP section and asking them if that would be clear enough for them.

Jim expressed concern that the document may not communicate straightforwardly, and the writers are the most responsible in this situation, thus, the wording choice decisions should be discussed with the readers as well.

To answer the question, philosophically, if one item of the whole IMAP component fails, it fails. Arnt said creating a lower tier than Silver would not make sense since Silver is for the basic sending/receiving functionality, apart from that, the rest

features should be Gold or higher. Mark said it should be easier to say “IMAP is not supported”, then to complain about failing one item.

Jim said a system may be made of a bunch of components, “if the system is advertised as supporting IMAP with a Silver certification, it would need to pass all Silver level tests.”

Arnt said in an extreme case, a software might test itself and score Silver or Gold but it could be a non-email-related application. Jim said there is a section on Tools that are not email senders or receivers that also should get certified like a spam filter. A spam filter does not host a mailbox, it only receives and passes the messages on, but it should be certified, the Address book should be certified, To-do list which sends email should be certified.

Mark said dropping the functionalities in order to score higher is not the intention.

Jim answered that the system should be well described and clear about what features are turned off or ignored. The purpose of this document is to enable free market and competition to affect the software features. Customers who are trying to evaluate purchase based on these certifications would do a certain amount of checking on vendors. If the vendor says the `-ls` command in Linux is Gold certified, the customer might say it does matter. Customers would be the ones who provide discipline, not us. Mark asked if their customer asked for IMAP, for the software developer to enable non-EAI-ready features, it would be unknown.

Harsha said he had had difficulty telling what these components are for the testers, the meaning of IMAP, POP and other components, apart from software developers, the clients may not know what are the components and what is it to test clearly. He means the person needs to be tech savvy to do the testing. Harsha trained some student interns to do the testing when testing is from the client perspective. Mark explained that a detailed report in technical perspective is required if someone is to claim the EAI-readiness level of their system as Gold, Silver or Platinum. For a marketing purpose, a rolled up report could be generated for client perspective.

Harsha asked to clarify the basic requirements of a Silver-certified system, emails of non-ascii could be sent, received with non-ascii headers, and saved in the address book. Mark answered that Harsha’s scenario fits a Silver system.

Nitin suggested that in the future, to respond to queries and troubleshooting answers for EAI-readiness self-certification, there might be a need for a sub-group to dedicate to answering the Self-certification guide users. The sub-group would

have the people of EAI-WG, who would manage the general queries and escalate the issues to EAI-WG when necessary. Nitin also said he would share the testing result of their application soon.

Abraham addressed Harsha's situation that the people are supposed to have the technical knowledge in order to test the system's EAI readiness, the components such as IMAP, POP, etc.

Abraham asked what are the conditions or criteria needed to assign to the person who would be running the self-certification. Mark answered that we do not have the capability to verify the claims or verify the person who is making the claim, which is why it is a self-certification.

Jim reminded us that we have a formulated spreadsheet to calculate the score based on Silver, Gold and Platinum test results. Jim asked the working group whether it is to be shared together with the Self-certification guide or for us to plug in the results coming back from the self-certification guide users. Mark said they should run the spreadsheet themselves. Jim answered to Abraham that we would not be in any way of controlling the developers in the process of testing, including the verification of technology background of the test running person. Abraham asked if it could be web-based, and Mark said it could be done theoretically, but was not implemented until now due to constraint of time and resources.

Before the meeting adjourned, Mark invited everyone to join the community presentation at ICANN76.

Next Meeting: Thursday 2nd Mar 2023 at 15:30 UTC

Action items

No.	Action Item	Owner
1	Share Testing results	Harsha
2	Share Testing results	Nitin