

UA Measurement WG Meeting

14 July 2022

Attendees

Nabil Benamar
Jim DeLaHunt
Sarmad Hussain
Carolina Caeiro

Meeting Agenda:

1. Welcome and Roll Call
2. Starting a new SOW for UA Curricula:
<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1EXHWWMt-sO1BFwCjx6m2oC55gpuLusl3/edit#>
3. Discuss further on the following document about IDN in Google Chrome
[https://chromium.googlesource.com/chromium/src/+main/docs/idn.md](https://chromium.googlesource.com/chromium/src/+/main/docs/idn.md)
4. What to take up next from FY22/FY23 Planning? Some options are:
 - a. Gap analysis of
 1. E-Commerce Platforms
 2. Content Management Systems - Phase – 2
 - b. Characterize how much Android platform limits acceptance of IDNs in web browsing
 - c. Analyze impact of the use of HTML5 email field
5. AOB

Meeting Notes

SOW for UA Curricula

Sarmad started the meeting by giving an overview of the Statement of Work (SOW) for UA Curricula which has been drafted based on the discussion in the last meeting. The SOW link has been shared for initial review, and he gave everyone a couple of minutes to go through the document and discuss.

Sarmad explained the description of different modules to add in the curricula of different programming courses taught at universities. There are four modules

defined under the first bullet in description. He also explained different contents to include in the target courses.

The third module below defined under “c” is related to conversions between U-label and A-Label.

“1.c. Introduction to domain names and internationalized domain names. Validating and processing internationalized domain names and internationalized email addresses in Unicode format.”

Nabil stated that explicit reference should be added for two languages Python and Java. He also mentioned adding the platforms for these two languages like Windows, Android and iOS. This input has been incorporated in the SOW.

Jim at this point mentioned that the description defines the product but does not mention the target audience or market for this activity. He insisted on defining the market in its description. Otherwise, he feared that the teachers and instructors might not be able to relate to it. Sarmad mentioned that it was added in the previous draft and removed in this one, but it can be added again. Sarmad stated that the draft has 2 parts. The 1st part is to compile the contents of the curricula and the 2nd part is about reaching out to the relevant organizations and departments to move forward. Current focus is on step 1.

Carolina at this point highlighted a point that defining the target audience should come before finalizing the curricula. She stated that there is a possibility that the teachers and the instructors might not be ready to add the content in their course. Sarmad added a comment in the document to involve faculty.

Nabil also mentioned the same point and gave a solution as starting a “train the trainer” program. It will handle the marketing part of the activity. Jim suggested starting a contract for needs assessment and outreach first that analyzes the market and the expected content for the UA curricula, which will eventually help us build a second SOW for the UA curricula content.

Sarmad suggested making a single SOW that covers both the needs assessment phase and the content development. Jim replied that this meets what he suggested. However, both works require different skills. And shared concern in giving these two types of work to the same contractor.

Sarmad suggested making a panel of contractors to have diversity in expertise (developers, academicians). Sarmad asked everyone’s opinion on this. Jim asked if previously ICANN had a contract with multiple vendors resulting in good experience. Sarmad confirmed that this model worked well previously.

Carolina shared that it makes sense to have one contractor for the content, but multiple contractors in different regions are needed for wider outreach.

Jim stated to have advisors to come onboard in WG and help in compiling SOW for content development. It will need persuading them to volunteer their time. He was not in favor of running a contract with multiple vendors.

Carolina noted that despite the challenges of having multiple vendors such as communication gaps, it is still worthwhile for including several regions.

Sarmad added that the advisory group can be diverse in regions and one person represents each region. The contractor needs to have its own panel of academicians and developers from several regions to make the needs assessment and content.

Jim also suggested having local ambassadors. Nabil mentioned that he understands the suggestion. He asked who will decide the advisory panel (WG or Contractor), and what the criteria are for selecting in the advisory panel. Nabil shared that he could help in this process as he already works in developing the content.

Sarmad clarified that the panel will be made by a contractor, and the specification of the panel will be decided on the SOW. Specifications may include regions, number of members and expertise of the panel members, scripts that will be used in their work.

Jim asked If the vendor assembles the panel, what happens at the end of the contract. Does the panel dissolve? It seems it would help us to have a panel with a longer time duration to oversee both content development and outreach.

Sarmad shared that it will be most likely a paid advisory panel and it will dissolve at the end. Sarmad shared the items everyone was aligned with. He stated that now we are moving into operation. He summarized the general agreement in the following steps:

1. Needs assessment
2. Advisory panel to guide that design
3. Evaluation of the course
4. Integration of the course in the curricula

Jim suggested having an advisory panel, attached to UASG instead of a vendor, who will do the needs assessment. Only when this is done, then we should come back and work on the SOW. He stated that academia outreach is the focus area of UASG. He also suggested having a separate academia working group which overlaps with other WG and provides help. We need some people who are ready to own it on behalf of UASG. Nabil agreed to it. Sarmad shared that creating a new WG is a much broader task and requires a lot of approvals from coordination and leadership. He stated that making an advisory panel will need less time. Jim agreed to it and stated that we can request some people from UASG who are willing to advise for this task.

Sarmad asked if a call could be made for volunteers. Nabil agreed. Jim suggested having Nabil Benamar and Andre Schappo for the advisory panel.

Next meeting: Thursday 28 July 2022 UTC 1600-1700

Action items

No.	Action Item	Owner
1	Review SOW for UA curricula	All
2	Reach out to community and invite them to volunteer	Sarmad