UA EAI WG Meeting
21 January 2020

Attendees

Abdalmonem Galila

Cheryl Langdon-Orr

Harish Chowdhary

John Donaldson

Katambi Joan

Kristina Hakobyan

Mark Datysgeld

Mark Svancarek

Nitin Walia

Sasa Kovacevic

Sushanta Sinha

Yao

Pitinan Kooarmornpatana

Sarmad Hussain

Agenda

1) Review notes from previous meeting
2) Good practice clauses (added during the meeting)
3) Best practices for email admins

Review notes from previous meeting

The WG members reviewed the 14 January 2020 meeting notes. There was no further comments.

Good practice clauses

The Good Practice Clauses for Universal Acceptance was shared. It was one way of working toward Universal Acceptance by ensuring that such a requirement is included in tender and contract documents. It was shared that the clause has been integrated in the procurement process for India.

Best practices for email admins

The WG members started the discussion on the best practices for email admins by going through the list of questions. The initial list of questions were:

1. Terminology
2. Length of a mailbox name

3. Consideration of security aspect
    1. Script mixing
    2. LTR and RTL script mixing
    3. Confusability
4. Consideration of management aspect
    1. Reserved words
    2. Mapping EAI mailbox to ASCII mailbox
5. Others
    1. …

The WG members considered the terminology of the mailbox name part. It was generally agreed to use "mailbox account". It was noted that another well-understood term was "username".

The length of the mailbox account was discussed. It was raised that Linux limited the account name length to 32 characters. Gmail policy limited the account name to 6-30 characters. The RFC5321, Simple Mail Transfer Protocol, limited local-part to 64 octets. The WG agreed to review policies for common mail services for more input.

The security aspect were discussed. The WG agreed that the mixed script should be prohibited. It was discussed that the exceptions to this are permissible for languages which conventionally require the commingled use of multiple scripts, for example Japanese. It was concluded that

i.   Script mixing is prohibited, except inclusion 0-9 digits
ii. For RTL script mailbox account, the European digits cannot be at the beginning
iii. If the script contains characters that resemble numerals or digits, they should not be mixed.

For each case, multiple example should be provided for clarity.

The GP members continued with the confusability considerations. The well-formed case was explained. In some scripts which vowel could be at the above position of the main consonant. If a user type two above-vowels consecutively, they could be rendered differently in different systems. Some system would shift the second one to the next position, some system would just replace it over the first one.

Unpredictable rendering could cause security issues. Therefore, there should be the rules to manage this. In this case, the rule restricting that 'an above-vowel can only follow a consonant' can prevent two consecutive above-vowels case to occur.

The WG members were informed about the concept of 'variant'. Variant labels were two labels which can be perceived as 'the same' to end-users. The definition of 'the same' could be different between communities. There are two main categories of variants, the semantic type and the visual type.

Examples of semantic type variants were raised:

- Eszett (ß) <-> double s (ss) can be used interchangeably in some part of German words.
- Two different glyphs of Simplified Chinese and Traditional Chinese which have the same meaning, same pronunciation, can be perceived as the same word for Chinese community.

An example of visual type variant; the character 'a' in Latin script and the 'a' in Cyrillic script. They are identical. Therefore, the two labels formed by two different scripts, can look the same and can cause confusability to the end users.

Three possible ways to handle variant issues for mailbox accounts was mentioned. (1) disallow the variant label to occur (2) define variant labels if one form of label was used for the mailbox account, the other variant labels should not be useable, and (3) define variant labels and assign all variant labels to the same user.

The WG would continue discussion in the next meetings. The WG members were invited to review the list of questions and prepare to discuss the management aspect consideration in the next meeting.

Next meetings: Tuesday 28 January 2020 UTC 0500-0600.

Action items

No.	Action Item	Owner
1.	*Review the existing email account length policies of common email service providers.*	*ALL*
2.	*Review the list of questions and prepare for discussion in the next meeting.*	*ALL*