Universal Acceptance

UA EAI Working Group Meeting
05 September 2023

Attendees

Mark Svancarek

Nitin Walia
Anna Bagadasaryan
Emmanuel Oruk
Harsha Wijayawardhana

Jim DeLaHunt
Krislin Goulbourne-Harry
Persis Yentumi
Sanoussi Baahe Dadde
Yin May Oo

Meeting Agenda:

1. Welcome and roll call

2. Draft an [SOW for FY24 Action Item E2.1](#) (Make it easier to experiment with a self-hosted working EAI systems)

3. Clean up the EAI Self Certification [Guide](#)

4. AOB

Meeting recording: [Link](#); password FLzMh+Yv73

Meeting Notes
Mark started the meeting reminding the WG about the main items to work on the EAI Self-certification Guide document. Those were the table of the 'Tools' and the table of the 'Documentation'.

Clean up the EAI Self Certification Guide
The changes previously made by Nitin were discussed. Nitin has revised the document during ICANN76 preparation.

Section: 'Documentation'
Doc.5: The requirement is to get at least the Silver level of scores.
Mark asked if this would apply to any older announcement saying they would support EAI, and would these candidates have to complete this for each level.
Nitin said there is no forcing to do the announcements.

Mark went back to the definition table of Silver, Gold, Platinum levels and made sure the requirements matched with the definitions. Mark said we can say they are encouraged to use these for announcements and publications. Nitin said the goal is to have more and more applications become EAI ready. Nitin suggested writing "Software vendors are encouraged…". Mark confirmed with Nitin and WG about using the "Silver level" or "Silver logo". It settled with using the level names "Silver", "Gold", "Platinum". And the level of support is described as "Applicable for [Level] or higher".

Section 10 : Tools
Mark said this 'Tools' section is unusual and the composite requirements are in a different style than other sections. Tools include address book, calendar, LDAP, anti-spam, mailing list redistributors, email filters, webforms and so on. After the row of Tool.1, additional rows were added to the table for the five functions: accept, display, process, store and validate.

Nitin pointed out that these are our expectations for the tools to meet. Mark said there might be tools that do not have much display, like there are tools which run in the background, and Jim added the example as "Spam filter". Mark reminded that spam filters may have a logging and the log might be counted as display. Nitin said to display correctly is one requirement to be at Silver level. Nitin said if the table is more compact, it would be easier for the users. Mark asked if we could put them all in the same row. Mark said it feels like we have a lot of requirements.

Jim said the bullet points of the Description of Tool.1 seemed to suggest separate rows. One bullet point was about domain name syntax. Another bullet point said regarding the mailbox name, the tool or utility should not attempt to parse and make a ruling on the mailbox syntax, because the mailbox syntax can be site-specific. Jim said as an example, one email provider refused to accept email addresses with the plus sign, and he was doing it wrong. In general, do not try to validate the mailbox name. The third bullet seemed to be clarifying the two previous bullets. If one does not accept anything from one TLD, and rejects all emails from that, that is not universal acceptance. The fourth bullet point is saying not to reject RFC-compliant email addresses unless their syntax is wrong.

Jim said the Description of Tool.2 was about displaying the email local parts as utf-8 and the domain names as U-labels, and not displaying as A-labels. Jim said this item would be a separate issue from Tool.1. Mark agreed with Jim's explanation and accepted his suggestions.

Jim suggested putting the 'accept' function at first because it is more general about accepting email addresses from any TLD with any writing system. After that would be about validating the TLDs and not validating the mailbox name syntax. Jim said these items seemed to be related to each other and separating them might not be very relatable. Mark agreed to edit according to Jim's suggestions.

The tool is expected to 'accept' unicode-encoded text in a language or writing system when the Input includes typing, pasting or using the input files for the text field, and includes domain names and email addresses containing characters from that language or writing system.

Nitin noted that the test cases for other parts were not divided according to the five UA verbs. Tool.1 is about accepting any writing system. Jim said the word 'accept' could have caused the confusion. Jim suggested that the text should change to *"Tool operates correctly on any writing system used for email addresses and domain names",* in the 'Summary' column. The 'Status' did not require changes. The 'Description' was rewritten by Jim.

Mark reviewed the description of Tool.1 one more time.
"Tool or utility operates correctly on Unicode-encoded text in any language or writing system, including domain names and email addresses containing characters from that language or writing system… Further guidance regarding local mailbox names is provided in the best practices document [UASG 028]."
Jim confirmed the description text can be this way.

Tool.2 was reviewed by WG, and Jim corrected some grammatical errors and wordings in 'Summary' and 'Description' parts. Mark asked to confirm if an email address is displayed in punycode, would it pass the Silver requirement. Jim would like to use a better word instead of utf-8, and would like to avoid ambiguous words like 'human readable' or urt-8. Jim explained that the 'display' of an email address should be correctly rendered in unicode.

Harsha said this looked like a basic requirement and suggested Silver. To Harsha's experience, most of the tools were still displayed in punycode. If we demand the display to be not punycode, most of the tools right now would not pass this test. Harsha would like to let some major email providers pass the test, and those service providers should feel encouraged to be EAI ready, including the display. Harsha said for those who cannot read the original language of the email address, punycode would be informative. Harsha also said Gmail provides automatic translations for now, however, for those who cannot read or type the email language of another language, punycode would be useful.

Nitin replied to Harsha in the chat: "Harsha problem is that Just by accepting, the system cannot become UA Ready : it must do all Accept. Validate. Store. Process. Display"

Jim also mentioned the term utf-8 may or may not cover all cases, and generally said the base-line is to display email addresses as unicode, unless otherwise requested by the user. Thus, the text in 'Summary' was changed as
"Product must display email local parts and domain names as Unicode."

The part "unless the user requested display as A-labels" was moved to 'Description'. The text is finalized as *"The product must be capable of displaying domain name parts as U-Labels. For clarity, domain names should be displayed as U-Labels, unless the user requests display as A-Labels."*

This 'Tools' section review would be continued at the next week's meeting. WG agreed to end the meeting since the time was up.

Next meeting: Tuesday, 12 September 2023 and 14:30 UTC

Action items:

No.	Action Item	Owner
1	Prepare for the next week UA-EAI meeting	Yin May