

UA Technology WG Meeting

06 December 2021

Attendees

Satish Babu
Rajiv Kumar
Vadim Mikhaylov
Mark Datysgeld
Jim De LaHunt
Seda Akbulut

Agenda

1. Welcome and Roll Call
2. Presentation on the progress of “UA Readiness Evaluation of Standards and Best Practices” work item (35 min)
3. Reviewing the [T5 – UA challenges and survey\[docs.google.com\]](#) (15 min)
4. AOB (5 min)

Meeting Notes

In this meeting the group reviewed the UA Readiness Evaluation of Standards and Best Practices work only. T5 action item about UA challenges survey will be further discussed in the next meeting.

The meeting focused on the work created as per the Statement of Work on [UA Readiness Evaluation of Standards and Best Practices](#).

The work has almost been completed except for some descriptions of the institutions. The core work has been completed which focuses on showcasing what opportunities there are, and what strategies we can build upon.

Based on Tech WG comments, Mark D. will wrap things up in the report in a week. Some of the best engagement opportunities we should have were highlighted in the gap analysis.

- For Unicode: “Internationalization and Unicode Conference”
<https://www.unicodeconference.org/> opens a door to conferences on this list. Conferences are not groups. But they are a forum for reaching other communities.
- The scope of the document, what things left out, and directions for future work needs to be added. Conferences in that section would be a useful place-marker.

- Each organization has been prioritized in three groups with color-codes. There are no parameters for ordering the organizations. Personal contact details are excluded. However, the contact details included are sufficient to connect with these organizations.
- It is easy to join directly to the community groups. On the other hand, joining the working groups requires a formal process, such as an interview.
- i18n WG has been found to be a valuable organization to be covered in this study. To join the i18n WG, the applicant needs to follow a formal interview process with R. Ishida, chair of the WG. They are aware of UASG, but not actively participating.
- The work clearly points out what items call for a Statement of Work (SOW). However, some part of this work is evolving by time. SOWs are bounded within a certain period of time. We should find a formulation to work on these topics either via SOW or some other ways.
- It was recommended adding to the WhatWG section a link to <https://github.com/whatwg/html/issues/4562>. WhatWG handles so many UA issues. Email input element WhatWG is working on should be included in the report as it is valuable for EAI.
- A guideline about DMARC, and what conditions enable UA readiness in terms of DMARC and email spam filtering, can be drafted with IETF.
- W3C: Accessibility education and outreach WG is more relevant to UA. A member of Tech WG, ICANN or UASG can be nominated to interact with this WG. They are willing to collaborate with UASG.
- HRPC: Some ICANN community members are also in HRPC group. They address Human Rights with UA. This path has already been opened. We need to further strengthen our collaboration.
- Unicode-ICU: The software library icu is included in UASG033 and in UASG018A as a valuable library for internationalization. Yet, it is not widely used. With the help of our outreach via Comms WG and Tech WG, there could be a win-win situation. Jim's expertise in Unicode can be a catalyst here. Jim commented that the icu library has a little more reach than is apparent, because it is an input to some other libraries which are more widely used. However, it still is not used as much as it should have been.
- Python Enhancement Proposal: Python idna module, version 3.3, claims support for IDNA2008 and UTC46. <https://pypi.org/project/idna/> This is also the 6th most used Python dataset. At the moment the core of the Python language supports IDNA2003. Integration of the idna module to the core of the language would have a favorable impact in terms of UA. Python language standards call for a SOW.

- It would be interesting to have a summary sheet, where the color coded interests and actionable items are shown in tabulation without putting a lot of text to depict a big picture of the whole work.
- Out of this work, we come up with a couple of strategies where Tech WG first needs to assign a champion to bridge between two groups. And then also we need to go through some formal processes to join these groups with the help of skilled people. For the latter, how many people will we require? What other resources will we require? These are the questions Tech WG should further study.
- Living or static document?: It would be helpful to have this report be formatted as a starting point for the living document. However, this is up to the Tech WG decision. At the moment, as per the SOW, it is a basis document that pulls up the call to actions. Satish suggested that Mark D. can add suggestions about utilizing the report whether as a living or static document, and what is the best way to move forward.
- Regarding the formatting of the document:
 - Having the table layout with keys and values was a better way to look up the information than having several paragraphs of prose.
 - Indexing and table of contents would be good to add into this reference document. Subjects like Python and then related entries within that would be a really helpful way to get into the document.

Mark D. stated that all of those tables will be converted to a database format after the IGF2021. The document will incorporate the feedback and be shared with the group again for further inputs.

Next meeting: 20 December Monday 2021 UTC 1600-1700

Action items

No.	Action Item	Owner
1	Circulate the final report “UA Readiness Evaluation of Standards and Best Practices” as well as the database format as a supplementary document with Tech WG	Mark D.
2	Provide feedback on the report of “UA Readiness Evaluation of Standards and Best Practices”	Tech WG