UA EAI Working Group Meeting
16 January 2024

Attendees

Mark Svancarek	John Levine
Nitin Walia	Krislin Goulbourne-Harry
Abdalmonem Galila	Kunle Olorundare
Anna Bagdasaryan	Arnt Gulbrandsen
Athanase Bahizire	Seda Akbulut
Jim DeLaHunt	Yin May Oo

Meeting Agenda:

1. Welcome and roll call
2. Developing a 5-year action plan for EAI WG to achieve the UASG's 5-year strategic plan
3. How could the WG help for the upcoming UA-Day
4. AOB

Meeting recording: Link; password 3%9&ce%vGA

Meeting Notes

Mark greeted the WG and shared the news of completing the SOW for E2.1 action item. This meeting would focus on the 5-year action plan of the EAI WG, and then the upcoming UA-Day would be discussed as well.

Agenda#2:

Mark started the discussion by recalling the action items with yellow highlights. Kunle said those were the inconclusive items and required further discussion.

E1.1 and E1.1 are action items related to the self-certification program. These are for all aspects of the self-certification, not just the guide or scoring template, but the aspect of promotion and publication.

Action items not related to the Self-certification need attention as well. One of them is (E2.1 - Make it easier to experiment with a self-hosted working EAI System). The SOW for this item was completed during the previous meeting.

■

Mark asked WG which action to start with. Jim and Abdal voted in favor of action items related to the Self-certification program.

E1.1 is the scoring template in the spreadsheet currently. Mark asked WG what to improve from here. Jim discussed the scenario of someone completing their own test with the self-certification guide and coming with their test results. The purpose is to turn the test result into a score. The tool could be any coding in order to calculate the test results into the score in a better way than just a spreadsheet. The next step would be what to do with the score. It could be an application or a webtool. Nitin agreed with Jim. Nitin also suggested sharing the initial state of the score-calculating spreadsheet, and then create a tool which would be easy to implement. If it were a webtool, the test results could be listed and disclosed straight away so that people can see the list of products with their EAI readiness level Silver, Gold or Platinum.

Abdal said if he were an end user email-administrator who would like to manage an email server with EAI readiness, he would be able to test out the system using this guide. An online form could be made in the place of a spreadsheet. The score calculation would be resulted in xml format, and it would be published in some way as a product information with their permission. Mark recalled the discussion of automating this process some time ago, E1.1 and E1.2 could be one item.

John shared that writing a script is relatively straightforward, however, to run it on different systems, it could take a lot of work. He could still give a script to do score generating, however, there would be no grantee that it would work on every environment. Mark agreed that this was attempted and non-trivial.

Abdal asked how an end would use the spreadsheet with trust. Mark said since this is already self-certification, there would be a lot of trust issues to overcome. Abdal said the spreadsheet would be more challenging than a web interface in this case. He suggested making a worthy website with a good interface for this. Mark said since this is already a part of 5-year planning, this would be carried out, and captured this as E1.3, "Automated tests (based on existing Levine scripts?) which submit to UASG for higher confidence". Mark sorted out E1.1, E1,2 and E1.3.

■

Jim followed up with Abdal that passing test results directly to UASG would become more credible, however, there still is a risk that people testing their own product might create incorrect results unavoidably. From a business perspective, the trust issue would be there and it is not UASG or WG's main concern. Nitin said it is unlikely to get wrong results because the objective is to self-check and improve their levels of EAI readiness. If any false information were published, the product could face more backlashes. For the online-webtool to generate the scores, as far as the score or the level is generated based on the inputs, there may not be much difference between a spreadsheet or a webtool. Abdal said some people might still try to appear as a better rank, so there is possibility. Mark said it would be hard to foresee at the moment, we need to find a way to increase our confidence in scoring.

Mark continued on with items related to UASG resources for future self-certifiers. Jim said E2.1 to E2.5 are related to one program.
E2.1: For someone who would certify their IMAP module and get the instructions. The stages after this would fall into E2.2 to E2.5 respectively.
E2.2: For a person to work on this, help and assistance on performing the tests.
E2.3: This is after getting the product ranking, and to decide their trustworthiness.
E2.4: Inside of UASG, this is for score discrepancy and figure out a way to solve it. Also to disclose the information of highly scored products if ICANN allows.
E2.5: Back to E2.2, selling platinum rated how this would help improve their sales. We need a good design to award them so that the customer will know the product is certified as a Platinum-level EAI ready. This is to pave a way for consumers towards the correct EAI-ready applications they may be looking for.

Mark said there is a question about whether UASG or ICANN cannot be a marketing advertisement board for proprietary software or brands. We could figure this out over 5 years. Mark asked WG if there was anything else to say. Jim jumped in and said that the high level goal is to unlock the market forces. It could be achieved only by having customers saying they want highly-certified products. We are just preparing before customers come looking for products or applications with EAI support. Mark clarified the list in the E2 'Timeline' column which was the whole cycle from the beginning to the end. Jim helped with edits.

■
E?.? This is to do in collaboration with the Measurement WG.

Nitin asked the following question in the chat.
Question: Who will be allowed to take this EAI test anyone or only OSD/OEM

Jim said the answer would be anybody. For example, one can test and certify the Microsoft Outlook for example and calculate the score. The issue of dispute would always be there. Some companies may not want to display their score unless it shows a very successful image. If necessary, we could hire some vendors to check the products and verify their scores. This would be a good point to consider in the future. Mark added that there is no stopping anyone to try and test a product against the self-certification guide, it may need an anti-dispute mechanism.

John asked about terminology, what the meaning of vendor was. If he were a hosting provider and testing his own system with the guide, would he call himself the vendor or user or anything else. John suggested using a clear term to call each role. Mark agreed to update on this.

Nitin added that letting people self-certify would open a lot of boxes of unknown. Would there be a competition, or would there be disputes, we better hire someone to do the test for them which would create less chaos. A competitor may submit a wrong result of a certain brand, if so, how the verification would go. Mark said it would be fine and read out Seda's comment in the chat.

 Seda:
Thinking out loud: If we don't publish on our website we don't need a dispute mechanism as that's not our role to resolve disputes. Anybody can do it and publish it on their own website. We may think of a disclaimer or have a vendor to verify the results when let's say we receive 3-5 results.

Mark said the email hosting provider (hoster) would have to determine their policy whether they would allow other people to test them and disclose the score. And there still could be trust issues. Seda added if multiple results were submitted for one brand, we would not know which one to be published.

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

Mark reminded WG of the time check, there was 12 minutes left.

Seda shared that there will be more than 50 UA Day events worldwide, onsite and online. The discussion points were UA Adoption and UA Curriculum, and the training event which might be related to the EAI WG. The UA Curriculum would be ready by the UA Day event time, and this is the work of UA-Tech WG and UA-Measurement WG collaboration.

From the UA-EAI WG, we could make self-certification related items, and Seda is working on publishing the SOW so that vendors could start to bid. For UA Adoption, there are some proposals to make existing email servers UA ready, they may be using the self-certification to check the requirements. If possible, they could combine the EAI related work. They may require some training, the trainers could be volunteers or recommended by the EAI WG. Seda invited WG to suggest any other activities that could be done as well.

Jim asked if he would be able to gather information about an EAI-ready email system. He would like to know the audience better in terms of EAI perspective. Mark liked the idea.

Mark said this would be a good topic to brainstorm next week, and suggested wrapping up the meeting.

AOB (The next meeting)

Mark confirmed that the meeting would be held at the same time next week. The meeting was concluded.

AOB (The meeting of UA Currifulum)

Jim asked Seda about Measurement WG and Tech WG at the meeting of UA Curriculum. Seda confirmed that this was scheduled two times to fit the WG schedules. Attending one out of two would do.

The schedules for UA Curriculum would be announced through their mailing lists.

Next meeting: Tuesday, **23** January 2024, **15:00** UTC

Action items:

No.	Action Item	Owner
1	Inform the WG for the new meeting time	Yin May
2	5-year action plan to be revised and concluded	WG
3	Brainstorm for UA Day activity	WG