

UA Measurement WG Meeting

4 September 2019

Attendees

Dennis Tan Tanaka
Dessalegn Yehuala
Marc Blanchet
Mark Datysgeld
Vrikson Acosta
Sarmad Hussain

Agenda

1. Roll call
2. Review comments to SOW UA-readiness of Open-Source Code
https://docs.google.com/document/d/1J3ahTuH_1_CzaPfGlnsLLitqhT0AUgATZQymEOVHSyc/edit#heading=h.cpqyi0wnysew
 - a. Comment were registered in the document and on the mailing list.
3. Time permitting, review comments to UA-readiness matrix
4. AOB

Meeting Notes

1. Chair Position(s) for the WG

The members were asked to share any interest to lead this WG on the UA measurement WG mailing list.

2. UA Readiness of Applications in Github and StackOverflow

The members continued to discuss the UA-readiness study review. The assessment of individual programming libraries has been done. Now this work looks at the UA readiness of applications. This would be pilot study to help scale it up based on the learning. The objectives were reviewed and closed.

Based on the input from the community, the group discussed if the scope should include additional languages. The group concluded to include Java and Python for the pilot exercise.

It was raised that if this work is being done just for applications or also for programming libraries. Also, if a library is included, how do we check if it is actually be used (and correctly). The members concluded to focus on the applications and also check if the library is being integrated in the application.

With regards to the testing, it was asked if arbitrary code is also being tested, in addition to the libraries. The group agreed that such ad hoc code was also in scope of testing. The objectives were updated accordingly. It was also raised how domain names and email addresses will be testing using UASG004, as the work will not run the code but inspect the code. The examples in UASG004 will provide the types to be inspected. This would be clarified further in the document.

For expected outcomes, the following table was suggested and discussed:

possible cases for apps to use well-known libs for UA	Possible conclusion	Next possible steps
app do not have any signature of a UA lib	most likely not supporting UA (because UA is difficult). it may be possible that they develop their own code, but most likely not.	ask maintainers if they are aware of UA?
app does have a signature of using a well-known old (for example idna2003) UA lib	most likely not supporting UA, since the library they are using is not supporting UA properly	tell maintainers to use a better lib
app does have a signature of using a known (good) UA lib	most likely supporting UA, but they may use it wrongly.	if we have time, test it? or read the code?

The members agreed to incorporate it in the existing table for outcomes. The additional expected outcomes were agreed with by the members. In addition, it was suggested to include to make a listing of functionality or uses relevant for checking UA and prioritize it, to eventually help develop solutions. E.g. beyond just validating domain names and email addresses. However, this may expand the scope significantly, especially if an email is identified as an identifier (and not an email address). This could help develop a map.

Action items

No.	Action Item	Owner
1	Volunteer for leading the UA Measurement WG	All
2	Review and provide further feedback on the draft of the study on measuring UA readiness for open source applications	All