

# UA Measurement WG Meeting

## 21 August 2019

### Attendees

Abdalnonem Galila  
Agafa Agafonika  
Dennis Tan Tanaka  
Dessalegn Yehuala  
Jennifer Chung  
Hazem Hezzah  
Marc Blanchet  
Mark Datysgeld  
Nicolas Fiumarelli  
Mauricia Abdol  
Roberto Gaetano  
Sarmad Hussain

### Agenda

1. Continue developing the pilot for assessing UA-readiness of open source applications.
2. Review and finalize UA-readiness matrix for Internet Browsers [https://docs.google.com/document/d/1-mRhBNetSKkQ3dc\\_ivQRU0YsrbBVkir9eB1nWwM0rSk/edit?pli=1 \[docs.google.com\]](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1-mRhBNetSKkQ3dc_ivQRU0YsrbBVkir9eB1nWwM0rSk/edit?pli=1 [docs.google.com])
3. AOB

### Meeting Notes

#### 1. UA Readiness of Applications in Github and StackOverflow

It was reiterated that the group will continue to develop the study to scan the open source code libraries to determine usage of domain name/email address validation – with new and long ASCII TLDs and IDN TLDs. As a starting point, the study will look at python code and github.

The group discussed how to shortlist such code which is being checked. It was raised if all applications should be considered the same, e.g. age, community activity, rate of recent downloads to gauge its popularity. Or should the group do an overall pass without any filtering out any applications. Statistics may be useful, but the right criteria need to be determined. For example, low changes may even mean that the application has matured. The trends and usage information on Github may be useful. The criteria can be iteratively developed.

A survey of developers was also suggested and the group member suggesting it was asked to develop the idea and share further details, e.g. questions to ask, where to conduct the survey, etc. Once the

details are posted on the mailing list, it can be discussed further if this is something which the WG would like to undertake.

Discussing the UA readiness further, the scope of testing was discussed. It was raised that UA readiness has five verbs. Do we want to limit this to validation? This should be done for both ASCII and IDN TLDs. However, if all the verbs are considered, it may increase the scope significantly. Perhaps start with the easier step, which can be finished quickly and then take the rest in eventual phases.

So it was suggested to focus first on accept, validate and process in the first stage, at least for the programming libraries. For applications, focus could be on accept and validate. Other verbs could be “nice to have”.

Beyond measuring, it was also shared that such libraries should be updated to support UA readiness gaps. This work should help identify which libraries to prioritize. Or should the group prioritize some other way?

Also test cases should cover new and longer TLDs within ASCII. However, as we are not testing but just reviewing the code, how will this be determined? It was also suggested to go deeper to look at methods as sometimes libraries are used but sometimes these validation techniques are hard coded. From the study on website evaluation, it was mostly arbitrary code inserted in the methods and libraries were not used as much.

It was also suggested to share the document with other UA WGs.

## 2. UA Readiness Scope Matrix

The group also took a short time to review the matrix being developed for the scope of UA-readiness. The members were asked to keep contributing directly to the google sheet at [https://docs.google.com/document/d/1-mRhBNetSKkQ3dc\\_ivQRU0YsrbBVkir9eB1nWwM0rSk/edit?pli=1](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1-mRhBNetSKkQ3dc_ivQRU0YsrbBVkir9eB1nWwM0rSk/edit?pli=1). The browser section will be separated to focus further on this aspect.

### Action items

No.	Action Item	Owner
1	Continue to develop study on UA Readiness of Applications in Github and StackOverflow	All
2	Separate the section on Browsers to expand it further	DTT