

UA EAI Working Group Meeting

26 September 2023

Attendees

Mark Svancarek

Nitin Walia

Abdalmonem Galila

Adarsh BU

Imran Hossen

Harsha Wijayawardhana

Jim DeLaHunt

John Levine

Sandra Rodriguez

Arnt Gulbrandsen

Seda Akbulut

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)
 - a. This score generator sheet to go along with the SOW:
[EAI Self-Certification Score Generator](#)
3. How could the WG help for the upcoming UA-Day
4. AOB: ICANN78

Meeting recording: [Link](#); password in\$V0aVFf2

Meeting Notes

Mark shared to WG that the EAI self-certification guide was completed in the last meeting, which was two weeks ago. WG is left with preparing the SOW for the FY24 Action Item E2.1 for the next step. Seda is working on this matter to publish the Self-Certification Guide document before the ICANN78. WG decided to work on the Score Generator first before tackling the SOW document.

WG will be preparing a presentation and talking points for the updates at ICANN78 Prep-Week UA Community Updates Session. The next meeting will be for preparation of the slides-deck for the ICANN78 presentation and talking points.

Agenda#2a Score Generator

Mark recapped the purpose and function of the Score Generator Spreadsheet for the WG members since this item had not been picked up for a while. This Score Generator holds the algorithm of scoring the test cases of the Self-certification Guide Document and helps determine the UA-readiness level of an application. The application owner may be able to share this.

The Score Generator includes these tabs: Total Scores, MUA+Webmail, IMAP, POP, MSA, MPA, MDA, MDA which supports IMAP, MDA which supports POP, MSP, Tools and Utilities, and EAI Communication and Messaging.

Nitin volunteered to check the changes in the finalized Self-certification Document and synchronize these with the test cases in the Score Generator. Nitin would work with Mark on these edits offline.

WG discussed determining the test level of some test cases and the scoring based on which component of the application had passed which test cases. The test demonstration work was done on the tab “MUA+Webmail”. Depending on the test case, the score can be obtained as Silver, Gold, Platinum or below all these. Failing the test cases of some essential parts would result in leveling down the application. The test cases of basic functions are in Green color for Silver level, the test cases for Gold level are in Yellow color, and so on.

Mark navigated the discussion towards these two tabs: “Tools and Utilities” and “Total Scores”. Abdalmonem raised a question on how to handle the situations of not knowing the existence of each component. What would happen to applications which could not pass the minimum scores. As an example, the basic case could appear in the “IMAP” or “POP”, and when the component is not responding, the testing would be replied with an error code. Mark summarized the example as if the component’s function is server dependent and if the server were to be down, the test of the example component would fail.

Jim said the evaluation needs to have more options than just ‘pass’ or ‘fail’, as it could be ‘Not Applicable’. There needs to have a way to document unresponsive server issues and would be good to note down the number of pass or fail at each attempt of testing.

Jim said in the case of Abdalmonem's example, if the testing attempts were unsuccessful because of the server or others, would there be an option like 'Try Again' or 'Attempt Later' rather than just 'Pass'/'Fail' indicators. Alternatively, the document can suggest to keep only the final results of the test and other test cases like the server up/down time, frequency of pass/fail should be another matter.

Nitin said the indicated parameters to be tested in each component are very clear, and the ambiguous cases would be rare to happen. Not meeting the requirements of test cases would mean the tool is not qualified enough as itself. If the application has only an MTA component, the testing should be focused on each component. When it comes to the 'Total Scores' part, the 'Not Applicable' case should be considered. The total score should come from the tested components, and not from not existing components which would be 'NA'. Mark said building a logical calculation based on the input components should be achievable.

Jim followed up by taking the example of the 'MUA' tab, if the application comes with an 'Address Book' functionality, there may be a result of 'pass' or 'fail'. However, when the 'Address Book' functionality could not be found, it should have an option to put 'NA'.

Mark explained that the logic is based on the 'pass' cases and any other result would be considered 'fail' and not add up to the scoring result. Nitin said the impact of considering 'NA' would affect the scoring of each level as well, since the minimum requirement is to pass all the 'Silver' level test cases. Mark said 12 'Pass' would not be equal to 6 'Pass' with 6 'NA'.

Jim said when an application is already at Gold level, and adding a new feature could pull it down to Silver level, the developer could be having doubts of adding a new feature. For the psychology of people using it with their own native writing systems, they may not want a 'fail' for their components. On the other hand, Jim said not completely filling up the test case results could amount to wrong scoring. The testers might skip some cases in order to make the resulting score look better. Jim suggested finding ways of reducing the data entry mistakes. Nitin said Jim's

point is noted, and currently the result would not be impacted by both 'NA' or 'Fail' and it only calculates the 'Pass' items.

Nitin said the possible 'NA' cases should not be at the 'Silver' level since they should not impact the basic requirements. Mark agreed. Jim suggested adding conditional requirements for the silver level, such as, if your software does function Z, this test case Z must be a 'Pass'. Jim, Mark and Nitin agreed on refining the philosophy. Jim said complicating the levels and logics may cause complexity of communication, so suggested keeping the levels simple: one Silver, one Gold, one Platinum, and no in-betweens. Jim said preventing misuses or miscalculations would not be handled as well.

Mark said options like all-tests applied, and such. However, this is a score calculation for existing components. Nitin said he would help with other tabs.

The draft of the Self-certification Guide has many test cases in a mix, the test cases of Silver, Gold and Platinum are based on each component and not on the test levels. Mark asked WG if we all agreed to leave it the current way. WG agreed.

29:00 minutes Abdalmonem left the meeting.

Agenda#3: How could the WG help for the upcoming UA-Day

Nitin said the next UA Day would be the same day as the previous time, 28 March. Nitin shared that this item is proposed by Abdalmonem, since the UA-Comms WG would start to accept UA Day proposals, and they would create a sub WG to review proposals. Nitin said it would be a good idea to wait for the UA-Comms-WG to finalize the UA Day planning first, and other groups would support according to the plan.

Jim said for the last year, the UA Day was thought of to be like an event, however, it stretched for three months and along the way, WG meetings were halted. Jim suggested not impacting the regular works of UASG WG's because of the UA Day.

Nitin said those hiccups in last year should not repeat because a special team would be created dedicated to the UA day events. Mark suggested continuing this topic when Abdalmonem would join at the next meeting.

Mark asked about the UASG and UA Day related sessions at ICANN78. WG would prepare to present the community during the prep-week.

Seda joined the meeting to explain about the ICANN78 prep-week, and the slide deck would be shared at the next meeting. Also invited WG to attend the session. There would not be a specific session for the UA-EAI WG at ICANN78. Mark said he would be traveling until 29 October, but he would present at the prep-week session on 10 October. The more detailed info would be shared to the mailing-list.

Jim said he did not know there would be ICANN78 coming up, and wished to be updated for the meetings if possible. Nitin explained that one can subscribe to the mailing-lists, and confirmed meeting time would be shared through email.

Seda said the session time for the prep-week was confirmed to be at 16:00 UTC. The other UA related sessions for the ICANN78 would be shared. Mark suggested the meeting ended.

Next meeting: Tuesday, 03 October 2023, **14:00** UTC

Action items:

No.	Action Item	Owner
1	Complete the Score Generator Sheet	Nitin, Mark
2	The logic of MUA Tab and Total score Tab	Mark
3	Share the UASG Community Update presentation to be reviewed and finalized.	Seda
4	Share the schedules with UASG and also EAI WG	Seda
5	Attend the prep-week UASG session	Mark