

# UA Measurement WG Meeting

07 April 2022

## Attendees

Nabil Benamar  
Jim DeLaHunt  
Allen Magezi  
Sarmad Hussain  
Seda Akbulut

## Agenda

- 1) Welcome and Roll Call
- 2) [FY23 Measurement WG planning](#) – by 15 May
- 3) AOB

## Meeting Notes

Nabil shared the summary of the last meeting points, where the status of FY22 action plan was updated, and new suggestions for FY23 listed. “Gap Analysis of 2000 websites” was handled by Tech WG and now it is complete.

Nabil gave a summary of proposed projects one by one. Sarmad shared a suggestion that if we think some projects should be done by our WG, it should be put on the agenda for next year and move forward. If some other WG comes up with the same project, then we can adopt a coordinated approach to process the project. This could be also handled at the Coordination meetings. He also suggested prioritizing the projects for better planning.

Nabil asked Sarmad about his views on the budget for projects. Sarmad shared that it should not be a concern as we always have a potential budget to cover it. Nabil agreed and shared that the point of concern should be the nature of the project. Sarmad shared that we should focus on what kind of and how many projects can be done in FY23. He also shared that one constraint should be about which projects will be done WG, and which will be done by contractors. Nabil appreciated these comments.

Nabil shared his thoughts on the first project “Academia Outreach: Developing UA curriculum at ACM”. He shared that some workshops were arranged in Africa region to create awareness on UA and the experiment was successful. He shared that the progress should continue by introducing more workshops and making UA part of curriculum in universities. It will enhance the knowledge of students and faculty about UA. Then he asked everyone to share their views on other projects.

Regarding initiatives for Academia Outreach, Sarmad shared that Curriculum should be made by measurement WG, but the outreach should be done by Comms WG and Local Initiatives. Nabil appreciated the idea and shared that we should come up with a draft document for workshops and then local initiatives can then adapt it in their language and proceed.

Jim asked if there are any large strategic goals or strategic situation for the UA overall, that should be considered as the planning is done for this year. Sarmad shared that there is no such strategy present to this planning apart from bottom-up approach which is being carried out currently by all working groups in this planning stage. With this bottom-up approach, WGs highlight what they want to do in the next year.

Jim shared a strategy on characterizing supply and demand paradox solutions. He stated that current services do not support UA and therefore customers do not ask for UA, and therefore existing services do not provide UA.

With our studies on identity platforms or web hosting tools, we will be able to say here are the platforms that support UA, and here the ones that are not good at UA.

Another example is that in the HTML5 spec, there is an element definition for an input field in a form of type email `<input type="email">` and the specification for that is ASCII only email addresses. The websites that use HTML5 technology limit globally inclusive email addresses.

Jim gave another example on Chrome browsers on mobile platforms using an outdated spec, and that’s why EAI is rejected. It would be interesting to characterize how bad a limitation like this is.

Nabil appreciated Jim’s point of view. Sarmad also had similar thoughts and shared that a study was being done by Mark Datysgeld on this. He shared that the points of that study can help us in coming up with a way to contribute to UA.

Sarmad shared a study to [measure indices](#) by ITU which can be an area Measurement WG to benefit from. For example, for such indices can we work with any other organizations to look into that? And should UA be one of the indicators in these studies? For instance, next time a similar study like this is conducted how many email servers are configured to support EAI may be an indicator for ICT access.

Nabil encouraged the idea and added that there was a slogan some years ago as “Internet for All”. For ISOC, ICANN, and for leading companies the aim was to make the internet multilingual and for all.

Jim shared the following three ideas and suggested adding them in the FY23 planning document.

- 1) Characterize supply limitation part of Supply-Demand Paradox. If someone wants to use a globally inclusive (EAI) email address as an identifier, what percentage of services do not accept it? Measure this in a repeatable way, so that we can measure how the situation improves or worsens over time.
- 2) Characterize whether HTML5's `<input type="email">` specification blocks websites from accepting globally inclusive email addresses as identifiers.
- 3) Characterize how much Android platform limits acceptance of IDNs in web browsing, because they stay compatible with the leader, Chrome on Android, which uses an outdated IDN spec (IDNA2003).

Nabil asked why the focus is on Chrome browser only, and whether other browsers should also be part of idea 3. Jim shared that Chrome has some specifications issues, and that’s why it is not UA compliant. He also shared that other browsers can also be analyzed under the umbrella of idea 3.

Seda shared that there are now 13 items in the list for FY23, which may be more than one can do in a year. She suggested setting the estimated timeline for all the projects and to set the priority of tasks to shortlist them in a way we can accomplish in a year.

Jim also shared that we should write a report on some email providers which are not leading and are providing better support for UA. He thinks that it would add pressure on the market leaders to adapt better UA functionality.

Jim asked about the usefulness of Annual UA Readiness Reports, and who reads it. Sarmad shared that it is shared within ICANN and on social media as well, but he is not sure how broad the audience is. Jim suggested having a report that

summarizes the situation for Universal Acceptance and it should be effective and powerful. He mentioned adding this in the FY23 list as well. Sarmad shared that currently results of all the UA studies are summarized in a single report so that anyone who needs a reference can find it. Jim stated the report consists of two sections. One of which is an annual report on UASG’s activities, who we are and what we do. The second section is about the studies conducted on UA. He suggested having two reports, one talks about us, UASG, and the other one talks about the world. Jim suggested renaming the document to “UASG Annual Report” or “Universal Acceptance Annual Reports”. Jim suggested writing a UA-readiness report separately which talks about the percentages of tools, domain names, etc. that are UA-ready.

Sarmad shared that the report covers UA readiness of several technological stacks at multiple layers. Jim mentioned that if someone needs to know more about UASG activities, they don’t need to review all details about those percentages. Likewise, if someone is interested in knowing UA-readiness of websites, mail servers etc. they don’t need to go through the UASG activities. Sarmad agreed to that and added that if the Measurement Group would like to use that way, they can extract from the current report two reports.

Th team will go through the suggested items and shortlist them in the next meeting.

**Next meeting:** Thursday 21 April 2022 UTC 1600-1700

### Action items

| No. | Action Item   | Owner |
|-----|---|-------|
| 1   | Share the draft document with everyone on email         | Seda  |
| 2   | Put more suggestions for project in the shared document | All   |