

UA EAI Working Group Meeting

19 December 2023

Attendees

Mark Svancarek

Nitin Walia

Abdalmonem Galila

Athanase Bahizire

Harsha Wijayawardhana

Jim DeLaHunt

Krislin Goulbourne-Harry

Nicolas Fiumarelli

Arnt Gulbrandsen

Seda Akbulut

Yin May Oo

Meeting Agenda:

1. Welcome and roll call
2. Review the new version3 of [SOW for FY24 Action Item E2.1](#) Make it easier to experiment with a self-hosted working EAI systems (without COI issues)
 - a. (Older version [SOW for FY24 Action Item E2.1](#))
 - b. [EAI Self-Certification Score Generator](#) to go along with the SOW (completed spreadsheet)
3. Developing a [5-year action plan](#) for EAI WG to achieve the [UASG's 5-year strategic plan](#) [to be discussed offline on mailing list]
4. How could the WG help for the upcoming UA-Day
5. AOB

Meeting recording: [Link](#); password L4hp+i^DaW

Meeting Notes

Seda started with presenting the updates of SOW as a priority topic, and also reminded that the 5-year action plan is also on the list.

Agenda#2: Review the new version3 of SOW for FY24 Action Item E2.1

Seda explained that the purpose of this SOW is to have some example of EAI-ready email hosting by the upcoming UA Day events in 2024.

The current SOW would be focusing on open source tools and components. Regarding the testing task with the commercial tools and services, Seda also

■
advised that EAI WG should bring this matter to the attention of Coordination WG, and receive endorsement. After that, ICANN's relevant team could work on this matter. Seda would update the upcoming Coordination meeting to Mark.

Mark quickly recapped the status of SOW to the WG. WG would seek a smaller and more practical solution for the open-source side. WG agreed to proceed.

Jim said he also joined the Measurement WG meeting and communicated about the possible collaboration tasks, and the Measurement WG welcomed. Mark mentioned that most WGs requested budget for the action items but ended up not using them, and it would be great to utilize the budget to good use by collaborations.

Section: 'Purpose'

Mark asked the WG whether the solution should be more than just one, and if the bids came in with fewer variations of solutions at a better price, to be accepted or otherwise. Arnt answered that he would suggest it to be more practical than procedural, since it would be challenging to suggest three different sets of installable software. Mark agreed and changed the wording to singular. Arnt also highlighted that it is for testing purposes only.

Mark said the server would be set up on the Linux machine and as well the client. Jim asked how to define server or client. Jim said if the server is an IMAP server and the people could use any clients connecting to the IMAP server then that would be good enough. Mark agreed with the point that the server would be able to work with any matching client. Jim asked to check if IMAP client or POP client exist and Arnt confirmed that they do. Mark said they may have bugs, however, having more uses would motivate them to fix the bugs. All these work will complement other initiatives to reduce EAI barriers to EAI adoption. This work should not require UASG to host the email server through years. Seda was advised to move some irrelevant text to the appendix.

Mark suggested keeping the texts as they are, and removing the irrelevant text after finishing the SOW.

■

Section: 'Structure of the Bid'

This part was confirmed. Arnt confirmed that Ubuntu and Debian are enough for testing purposes. WG does not see this as a limitation.

Section: 'Description of Work'

Jim suggested elevating the numbering to make it easier. The newly suggested changes were accepted. Arnt and Jim helped smoothen out the wording in the three parts of the description. The terms are to be synchronized with the 'Purpose' section.

Section: 'Deliverables'

Jim asked if the contractor should have the flexibility to choose the components. Mark also asked about specifying the components or let the recipe be adjustable. Mark would like to say 'All the sections of the Self-certification guide must be represented', and then again, it would not be necessary to have them all at once.

Seda added that being specific at some point should be alright. Seda suggested not detailing too much however there should be requirements as well. Jim asked when we want a contractor to complete a system, the required services such as IMAP, SMTP or Anti-Spam could be listed. Nitin said "We need a package that works from the contractor". Arnt pointed out that Anti-Spam and MX gateway are similar but not the same.

Mark also asked about the documentation if it would be a sign of completion. Mark also asked about an address book. Nitin pointed out that we are making a package with components, for the user's own environment. Leaving out some components like POP, it may not be a good idea. Jim said it could be an optional. Arnt mentioned [RFC6856](#) suggested POP supporting UTF-8, but an RFC does not confirm there is a UTF-8 support POP component. So Mark listed POP in, and kept it as an optional component. Arnt supported Nitin's suggestion on adding prompts for IDN configurations. Arnt also explained why Ubuntu and Debian are stable releases.

Mark asked if GPL was regarded as the same as open-source. Jim explained that descendants of the GPL should also be GPL. Arnt suggested avoiding the term. Jim suggested that as long as the license is no-charged, it would work.

■

Seda asked if the program should run for a long term or only for testing period. Mark and Jim suggested “The program must run on the Long Term Support (LTS) versions of both Ubuntu and/or Debian”.

The SOW was not able to be concluded before the break, and this will be resumed at the first meeting of 2024.

Publishing the results of EAI Self-certification

Seda shared that the self-certification guide said something about listing the scores of the products somewhere. When it was expected to test their own products, the ability to check their scores and test results would be limited. There would be some legal responsibility to list their scores since these could be easily forged. The product owners could display on their own websites and refer to UASG as reference of the guide and the scores. The only thing is ICANN or UASG would not be able to list the EAI readiness scores of the products publicly.

Mark said we could hire a third party to test the self-certification claims before publishing their EAI status. EAI WG may need to work with the Coordination or Measurement WGs. Jim also suggested talking things out with the steering committee about this because this was a motivation factor for email softwares to work on supporting EAI.

Mark said a standalone page which lists compliant solutions could raise concern differently than a third party created report. Nitin said what would motivate the self-certificating users if their results are not published and acquire attention. Arnt said the benefit would be for them to check up on themselves and know where they are in terms of EAI readiness. Mark agreed that people may have different motivations, and the purpose of the guide was to check their products using the guide, and suggested continuing the debate for the next meeting. Mark would bring this matter to the coordination WG as well.

AOB (The next meeting)

Mark confirmed that the meeting would be held at the same time, after the year-end break.

Next meeting: Tuesday, **09** January 2024, **15:00** UTC

Action items:

No.	Action Item	Owner
1	Inform the WG for the new meeting time	Yin May
2	Revise and finish the SOW by next meeting	WG
3	Communicate with Coordination WG on the matter of EAI Self-certification guide	Mark