UA Tech WG Meeting

08 November 2021

Attendees

Satish Babu
Jim DeLaHunt
Mark - from OXIL
Georgia - from OXIL
Emily Taylor
Abishek Mishra
Guillaume Blanchet
Jbernard
Vadim Mikhaylov
Sarmad Hussain
Seda Akbulut

Agenda

1.   Welcome and Roll Call

2.   Draft report on "UA of Browsers" and "Social Network Applications" by OXIL

3.   Finalizing the T5 – UA challenges and survey[docs.google.com] plan, and starting on SOW

4.   AOB

Meeting Notes

Draft report on the "UA of Browsers" and "Social Network Applications"

The study on UA readiness evaluation of browsers and social media platforms have been shared with the Tech Working Group for their reviews and inputs. The work has been initiated by the Measurement WG through an SOW. The work has been shared with the other working groups earlier. All technical UA members are requested to provide input by 15 November. Upon that, the contractor will further update the report and finalize it.

As for the browsers' evaluation, the work followed a methodology of pasting (not typing) an entire URL in the location bar to see whether it loads the correct page and whether it displays the URL correctly. The contractor also made additional tests to see whether the page title displays correctly and if it is bookmarked or added to the favorites section with a correct

display. The regular tests showed successful results. However, the additional tests (bookmarking, etc) resulted in some weaknesses. It was commented that typing versus pasting the URL would not change the results much.

In the report, the lighter of the green color represents better UA support, and the darker the lesser support. It was commented to reverse this colour scheme. The report for the browsers focuses only on the browsers that are shortlisted in the SOW document. Including the Xiaomi MI and Linux browsers in the SOW would have been better.

The methodology for social media platforms is divided into two sections. The first section is about registration and authentication, and the second is about posting a message. One of the main findings in this report is that native apps provide better support for a specific region and their script. Regional adoption of IDNs, e.g. Cyrillic, works well in applications that are dominant in Russia for instance, but not the other non-ASCII scripts. In Asia, phone numbers are widely used for account registration. For policy reasons, many don't allow linkification. Some are limited to Gmail accounts for registration.

As some internet users prefer to use a single email address to register all social media platforms and connect them to each other, if one of them is not accepting non-ascii characters then they may revert to ascii email addresses. Thus the supply and demand paradox emerges. The draft version of the report is only for circulation to get inputs, and it will be converted into the UASG brand before it is published.

Survey about the UA Challenges

The survey aims to showcase the experience of the actual people who are fixing the UA problems.

The Tech WG discussed the next steps for the survey. Whether we should do a consultation with the ICANN community UA experts (between 10 and 20 people) including the ones from the advisory group, as the next step, or whether we should bring in the contractor to complete the set of questions and conduct the survey based on community review and feedback.

Main approach is to complete the set of questions as much as possible and ask input from other working groups, coordination WG, and the advisory group of ICANN community experts. We want to identify a focus group of real experts who have spent time on UA problems, or tried to implement UA. We don't want anybody's comments who are new to UA.

It was commented that once questions are finalized, the survey can be sent to ICANN community experts. Alternatively, sending the questionnaire to the ua-discuss list is one of the options as the members in the list are the ones who are more involved in UA issues, and might be more responsive. However, as there are many others who are not experts in the ua-discuss list, it may cause a cacophony that can make it difficult for us to contain the main point. Another argument was not discussing the ua issues in the ua-discuss list. We can certainly discuss it in the discuss list, but should not consult for input from experts through that list. To

prevent the cacophony, an approach was recommended where a moderator in the group can expel people who are disruptive. This may also help clear the list for the future elections.

It was suggested that we create the survey questions along with clues for answering built in as options. Having a drop down list of answers for each question may help interpret the overall picture to UA challenges. The UA experts can also provide feedback on the list of answers. However, we may go for an open live session with the community to get their feedback. So having an open-ended conversation is very important to get all sorts of feedback.

Regarding the top issues in Universal Acceptance of non-Latin email addresses and domain names, a slide has been shared within the group members:
http://blog.jdlh.com/en/2021/10/31/top-issues-universal-acceptance-iuc45

The agenda of next meeting was identified as to continue discussion on T5 methodology. The group will further take a decision on the steps for getting the comments from experts (advisory group, coordination and other WGs).

Next meeting: Monday 22 November 2021 UTC 1600-1700

Action items

No.	Action Item	Owner
1		
2		
3		