

UA Measurement WG Meeting

09 June 2022

Attendees

Nabil Benamar

Jan Jansen – Nexperteam BV

Oana Bota – Nexperteam BV

Jim DeLaHunt

Vadim Mikhaylov

Sarmad Hussain

Seda Akbulut

Meeting Agenda:

1. Welcome and Roll Call
2. Presentation by Nexperteam about the draft test plan and test cases for web hosting tools
3. AOB

Meeting Notes

In this meeting we had experts from Nexperteam from Belgium to present the first milestones of the web hosting tools' UA readiness study:

1. Draft test plan and detailed test cases for testing UA readiness of web hosting services.
2. Final test plan and test case suite for testing UA readiness (spreadsheet with test cases) incorporating community review.

Jan shared a short summary of the presentation regarding the status of readiness of popular Web Hosting Tools. He gave an introduction of the Nexperteam and core businesses of it including Cloud Consultancy & Migration Services, IT infrastructure and Web Development & Testing. He also shared different roles of team members in the company.

Jan shared that the purpose of the project is to assess to what extent cPanel, Plesk and ISPConfig ("Web Hosting Tools") offer the capacity for customers to build websites and host emails in compliance with Universal Acceptance.

Jan shared the tasks completed by the team. Identification of the supported platforms to test "Web Hosting Tools" and environment selection have been done. Environment selection details were provided on which platforms the Web Hosting Tools to be installed, including a selection of mail services, web services and database software. All web hosting tools used offer postfix and exim in email servers. Moreover, all three web hosting tools are compliant with Linux Debian and Linux RPM based distribution systems.

Jan also shared that the draft test plan has been created to describe the testing approach and overall framework that will drive the assessment of UA-readiness of the "Web Hosting Tools" in the selected environment configurations.

After that Jan shared the typical test cycle. He shared the steps for testing. A set of overarching categories was devised for conducting a Universal Acceptance readiness study of the Web Hosting Tools. Test cases per category were created including the necessary details to execute the tests. He shared the different scenarios data sheet and all test cases summary.

Jan also presented the different Test Domains and Test emails of different scripts.

After testing, a document will be prepared listing the details about the environment configuration under test, including precisely which version of the components was analyzed, pass/fail indication for each test case, summary of the failing behavior for each failing test case and summary of the overall results, including total pass/fail counts, and whether the Web Hosting Tool under a specific environment configuration passed all test cases.

Jan then shared the future milestones of the project and ended the presentation.

Feedback1

Sarmad encouraged the efforts of the team and asked if they wanted to have email boxes within the scripts to do the testing. Jan responded positively. Sarmad asked Jan to send an email with a list of mailboxes to be created. Credentials will be shared for its access. It will be a single mailbox which has multiple aliases in each of these scripts. However, Sarmad asked for 2 weeks of notice to create this as this will be done by another team within ICANN. Jan appreciated Sarmad's

offer. The emails shown on the below slide are auto-response emails, meaning that when an email is sent to those email addresses, it sends an auto-response back saying that the email has been received. This shows that it works.

UASG004 #	Category	Email Address	Script
34	Unicode@IDN.IDN (RTL)	تجربة-بريد-الالكتروني@تجربة-القبول-الشامل-موريتانيا	Arabic
37	Unicode@IDN.IDN	почта-тест@универсальное-принятие-тест.москва	Cyrillic
38	Unicode@IDN.IDN	ईमेल-परीक्षण@सार्वभौमिक-स्वीकृति-परीक्षण.संगठन	Devanagari
40	Unicode@IDN.IDN	ηλεκτρονικό-μήνυμα-δοκιμή@καθολική-αποδοχή-δοκιμή.ευ	Greek
43	Unicode@IDN.IDN	이메일테스트@다국어도메인이용환경테스트.한국	Hangul
50	Unicode@IDN.IDN	ഇമെയിൽ-പരീക്ഷണ@സാർവത്രിക-സ്വീകാര്യതാ-പരീക്ഷണ.ഭാരതം	Malayalam
53	Unicode@IDN.IDN	ఇమెయిల్-పరీక్ష@యూనివర్సల్-ఆమోదం-పరీక్ష.భారత్	Telugu

Feedback2

Test cases

#	Test Scenario	Category	Test Case Summary
1	Test environment configuration	ENV	1.1 Check if the web server supports UTF-8 in default installation. 1.2 Check if the DB supports UTF-8 in default installation. 1.3 Check if Email system is UTF-8 compliant.
2	Test access	ACC	2.1 Create accounts with different roles using UTF-8 credentials. 2.2 Check that those accounts can log in.
3	Test Domain	DN	3.1 Create domain names, check that they are properly visualized and manage zones.
4	Test Email	MAIL	4.1 Create UTF-8 mailboxes that allow sending and receiving emails. 4.2 Create UTF-8 email aliases for the mailboxes. 4.3 Send and read emails to/from UTF-8 mailboxes and UTF-8 email aliases and check their content is ok.
5	Test Database	DB	5.1 Create DB user accounts with UTF-8 credentials and check that you can access the DB with those accounts. 5.2 Check that you can store and extract data in native scripts into and from the DB.
6	Test Website Hosting	WEB	6.1 Publish a website for the web domain names.

Sarmad also asked if the scripts can handle email addresses in Punycode forms. Jan shared that it will be tested, and results will be shared. Adding that root zone files do not accept UTF-8 so they will need to be converted to A-Label. So there is a need to explicitly test the two forms separately.

Sarmad also pointed out the normalization of domain name characters for testing. Normally, the code should handle normalized forms, meaning that if the input domain name is not in NFC form -the normalization form, the Unicode-, it

should actually convert it to NFC form before processing it. Emojis are excluded in this work, but “e”, “E” with some accents can be included in the tests.

Feedback3

Sarmad had another question about bug reporting. He asked if it is a part of the future milestones planned. Jan shared that it is. He didn't mention it in the presentation as presentation time was limited. But it is included in the word version provided earlier to the WG.

Feedback4

Jim thanked Jan for a comprehensive presentation. Regarding the objective of this work, Jim gave an example of a small business without an IT team who wants to develop a website using the ISP's features. We want to see in the report what kind of problems they come across, and whether developing a website for such users is easy, difficult but can be solved with such steps, or impossible to do. Jim suggested that having such remarks in the report very briefly at least at a high level would be very useful. Jan agreed to include a couple of paragraphs about the end user experience in the report. He added that there could be even additional paths for specific language or script. For instance, setting a website in Chinese script works well in X tool whereas it requires additional configurations for y tool. Although such tasks are not mentioned in the SOW, Jan perceived the overall goal based on this feedback. The pass and fail test report will show the UA readiness of each web hosting platform for different scripts. So, the end user can easily select the best tool according to its use case. Jim agreed to Jan on this.

Feedback5

Sarmad added a comment that we have been using a summary color coded table in other reports as a visual cue for the readers on how the tools support UA. E.g., <https://uasg.tech/download/uasg-037-ua-readiness-of-some-programming-language-libraries-and-frameworks-en/> Oana appreciated this comment and agreed to add it in the report.

Feedback6

Nabil asked Jan if the selected web hosting tools are used in the production environment or not. Jan shared that all the tools are chosen after internet research and are used in production environments.

Nabil also asked about the version of operating systems used to make sure if there are big differences between two versions. Also it would be good to add some comments in the report why these web servers are selected. Jan shared that the

latest versions were recommended and more commonly used, except for CentOS 7 is not the latest version.

Jim asked three additional days to review the documents to share his overall feedback. He will share it with the WG and then Seda will compile all the other feedback, if any, and will forward it to Nexperteam by 17 June 2022.

Next meeting: Thursday 30 June 2022 UTC 1600-1700

Action items

No.	Action Item	Owner
1	Review the additional documents for the Web Hosting Tools and will provide feedback in 3 -5 days	Jim / all
2	Share all emails with Nexperteam (Jan. and Oana) by 17 June at latest	Seda
3	Creating new mailboxes: Jan to send an email about the new mailboxes (with 2 weeks' notice notice), Sarmad to share the credentials	Jan / Sarmad
4	Share feedback on the Nexperteam's report and documents by 17 June	Jim, Measurement WG