

UA EAI WG Meeting

24 August 2021

Attendees

Abdalmonem Galila
Mark Datysgeld
Mark Svancarek
Nitin Walia
Sasa Kovacevic
Pitinan Kooarmornpatana
Jim DeLaHunt
Seda Akbulut
Samantha Mancia
Vadim Mikhaylov
John Levine

Agenda

- 1) Welcome and roll call
- 2) Continue work on [self-certification guide \[docs.google.com\]](#)
- 3) Planning work focused on new stakeholders:
 - a. TLD registries and registrars
 - b. Academia
- 4) AOB

Meeting Notes

Work continued on the self-certification guide, in the Email tools and Utilities Functions Summary section:

- It was noted that the WG previously decided to rewrite the rows in order to more clearly differentiate between the UA verbs
- It was noted that many of the rows have the same problem – accepting, storing, processing, and displaying are combined and it would be better to separate them.

Row 2: “Product must display email mailbox in native characters and domain names as U-labels, by default”

- A question was posed as to what is meant by “native characters”
 - o It was noted that “Native characters” refers to local language
 - o A suggestion was made to use the term “text” instead
- A decision was made to break row 2 into two parts:
 - o Display domain name parts as IDNA U-labels
 - o Human readable mailbox part

- It was noted that it would be more beneficial to allow for some more time to discuss, rather than take up meeting time
- An action item was assigned to Jim DeLaHunt to start a discussion on this topic in the list
- A question was posed on what the Unicode specific term is for how code points are rendered
 - Mark Sv took an action to ask his Unicode expert colleagues about this

Row 3: “Product support mailbox names spelled with UTF8 characters”

- It was noted that “spelled” was the wrong term to use here
 - A suggestion was made to change to “containing UTF8 characters”
 - A suggestion was made to change to “encoded”
 - A decision was made to change to “consisting of UTF8-encoded characters”
- A question was posed on what “support” means in this context
 - A suggestion was made to change to “handle” or “render”
 - A note was added to clarify that the verbs are:
 - Accepts, stores, displays, processes, validates
 - It was noted that this row will be broken into more than one row using the various verbs

Row 4: “Product supports any ASCII-only email address compliant with email specs, including ‘+’ and ‘%’ in mailbox names”

- A suggestion was made to change “supports” to “handles” or “renders”
- The term “specs” was updated to say “RFCs”
- It was noted that the wording excludes the requirement that if the mailbox name has Unicode characters outside of ASCII, you’re no longer required to support + and %
 - A question was posed as to whether to say the product has to support them in order to get a metal rating
 - It was noted that Unicode doesn’t change either of them
 - A decision was made to delete this portion since EAI is not concerned with supporting + and %, it applies to local policy with most admin rejecting % and very little known about +
 - A proposal was made to move to another section saying they’re defined in the RFCs, but the guide will not emphasize + and % (a non-requirement)

Row 5: “All data fields of type email address may store, retrieve and pass on unmodified any international email address”

- The term “email address” was put in quotes
- An example was given of HTML5 with a data type called email address, a question was posed as to what such a thing should do
 - It was noted that it should allow any reasonable EAI address
 - It was noted that it should pass on unmodified – meaning syntax checking should be very light, possibly even only checking for an @ and domain
- A suggestion was made to use “shall” or “must” instead of “may”.
 - The word “may” was removed and the verbs were updated to say “stores, retrieves and passes”

- A decision was made to change the text in row 5 to state: “product does not modify contents of data fields of type ‘email addresses’ except when required by user”
 - o It was noted that the intent is to make sure conformance checks that modify inclusive email addresses are not applied
 - o It was noted that the requirement is that EAI values are valid and should not be messed up in data fields of type email address
 - A question was posed as to how one can know that it is data which is an EAI unless syntax checking is done, which leads to this problem in the first place
 - It was noted that fields intended for email addresses should accept EAI addresses with a footnote stating that it is understood that it’s a regular expression but it’s wrong in the EAI world
 - The group ended the discussion at this point to be resumed in the next meeting

An agenda item was requested for future discussion – Adding a comment or proposed text regarding how ratings for email components relate to ratings for email systems built of those components. See email thread “Re: [UA-discuss] UASG blog on UASG030A report” on ua-eai email list.

The group discussed the new stakeholders added as a part of public comment feedback and how they might apply to the EAI FY22 Plan:

- TLD registries and registrars
 - o It was noted that EPP spec changes are going on, which should be monitored as it impacts Contracted Parties
 - o It was noted that in general comms make should sure that Registries and Registrars are treated as valid stakeholders, whatever materials they create can help people understand it’s also about EAI
 - o It was noted that Registries and Registrars are a very important representative of the types of companies the EAI WG would be going after with best practices guides and self-certification guides because sign up is done with an email address.
 - It was also noted that they should also be able to send notifications through their systems to EAI email addresses
 - o It was noted that ccTLDs have shown the most interest in being engaged on a superficial level as they have been doing UA/IDN the longest
 - It was noted that demonstrations could be held to show them the work that has already been done
 - It was noted that ccTLDs all have different structures/scale, some of them are aware generally of IDN and EAI while others are just doing the basics.
 - A suggestion was made to make 1 presentation on it as a part of broader engagement with ccNSO, more than that could be a waste of time
 - It was noted that registries who provide IDN domain names should have systems that are ready to handle the EAI email addresses into the registry registration pages/contact

- A suggestion was made to have them as an option to be used for case studies
- Academia
 - It was confirmed that academia is indeed a stakeholder for EAI, and has always been a target for outreach
 - It was noted that to reach out to academics the EAI WG could conduct activities such as writing papers on the subject or presenting at a conference (a more effective option than doing one on one meetings with faculty)
 - It was suggested to make a framework and incorporate some bells and whistles and present it within an academic setting – technology conferences, etc.
 - It was noted that the emphasis is not so much on the content as it is on the formatting – summary up front, published in a certain place, etc.
 - It was noted that academia can help if they add how to make systems EAI ready in their course material
 - It was noted that this is a worthy goal, previously discussed but outreach perhaps wasn't done properly at the time
- The discussion ended at this point, noting that the Registries and Registrars require little work as stakeholders, but would be good to do. No consensus was reached yet on what to do with academia. The group will resume discussion on the subject of academia in next meeting.
 - A suggestion was made to go through action items in EAI FY22 plan and see if any of the action items are relevant to the new stakeholders

Next meeting: Tuesday 31 August 2021 UTC 1530-1630

Action items

No.	Action Item	Owner
1	Start a discussion on the list regarding Row 2 of the Email Tools and Utilities Functions Summary section of the Self-Certification Guide	Jim DeLaHunt
2	Ask Unicode experts about the Unicode specific term is for how code points are rendered	Mark Svancarek
3	Add to a future meeting agenda for discussion: Adding a comment or proposed text regarding how ratings for email components relate to ratings for email systems built of those components. (See email thread "Re: [UA-discuss] UASG blog on UASG030A report" on ua-eai email list.)	Sarmad