UA Measurement Working Group Meeting
24 July 2019

Attendees:
1. Dennis Tan (Interim chair)
2. Chokri Ben Romdhane
3. Hazem Hezzah
4. Jennifer Chung
5. Marc Blanchet
6. Mark Datysgeld
7. Michael Casadevall
8. Nitin Walia
9. Oreoluwa Lesi
10. Pitinan Koaarmornpatana
11. Roberto Gaetano
12. Taiwo Peter Akinremi

Meeting Agenda
The meeting focused on the following Action items from the previous call:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Circulate a brief paper on how to interact with Github and other such platform</td>
<td>Marc Blanchet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Develop an initial high-level grid to capture the measurement space for UA-Readiness for further discussion</td>
<td>Dennis Tan Tanaka and Sarmad Hussain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meeting Notes
The Following findings on non-compatible UA code in Github (circulated by Marc Blanchet) were discussed.

1. From the testing of libraries and languages for UA compatibility, identify the signature of those libraries (the compatible and non-compatible).
2. Identify the standard language/framework calls that are known to not be UA compatible
3. Develop a crawler that would go through Github (repos source code), search for the signatures/calls listed in 1) and 2), and put this in a « database » with various meta-data of the repositories, which would help prioritize the repos.
4. Report the findings of both types (UA compatible and non-compatible)
5. Identify a strategy to contact the maintainers of the repos that require attention
6. Contact the maintainers and « train » them on what should be done.
7. Go back to 1,2,3 and further enhance the search, the signatures, etc...

Although there is not a complete set of solutions to common problems, it was discussed and generally agreed that work should be done in parallel as there is a need to know which code libraries and languages and under what circumstances they are compatible and non-compatible with Universal Acceptance. It was noted that IDNA 2003 and 2008 are a reference in terms of how libraries should be deployed.
One input noted that it would be difficult to automate the crawler across all the libraries and languages as it would return many false positive and false negative results, specifically because certain programming languages have undecidable grammar (C++) and others popular with commercial enterprises would have licensing problems due to not being open source; there is great difference between what languages are preferred by commercial enterprises and the open development community.

It was agreed that the WG should develop a process. As a starting point it was agreed to start with one language and program a crawler with Blanchet’s framework. Focusing on one language to test as a pilot can test and validate the approach, and it can be extrapolated to other languages. Further information on market share of programming languages in the world was requested, languages used in Github was shared: https://www.benfrederickson.com/ranking-programming-languages-by-github-users

Python was selected as the focus of the pilot as it is well-implemented and tested, doesn’t need to be compiled, and has a very active development base. It was noted that Python’s core library supports IDNA 2003, not 2008, thus further outreach needs to be done with the developers. Python 3 should be used because the legacy 2.7 version will be deprecated.

**Discussion on Agenda Item 2 (Action Item 2 from last call):**

A framework spreadsheet prepared by Dennis Tan and Sarmad Hussian (https://docs.google.com/document/d/1-mRhBNetSKQ3dc_jvQRU0YsrBVkIr9eE1nWwM0rSk/edit?usp=sharing) was shared with the Measurements WG and questions and input sought during the call.

The term ‘user stories’ was changed to ‘use cases’ for clarity as this field describes user action and desired outcome. In addition, it was pointed out that certain platforms (such as Facebook etc.) have both a web presence and a mobile application and the UA rate may differ between the two instances, thus there may be a need to further break down every application in this context.

It was agreed to circulate initial high-level grid to capture the measurement space for UA-Readiness to Measurement WG and UA discuss mailing list for input on list and use cases for mobile applications by next week (August 2), and social media by the week after (August 16).

**Action Items**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Write a framework to look at UA readiness of programming languages (Python as a pilot) based discussion on the call.</td>
<td>Marc Blanchet, Michael Casadevall, Mark Datysgeld</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Circulate initial high-level grid to capture the measurement space for UA-Readiness to Measurement WG and UA discuss mailing list for input on list and use cases for mobile applications by next week (August 2), and social media by the week after (August 16).</td>
<td>Dennis Tan Tanaka</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>