

# UA Technology WG Meeting

## 29 August 2022

### Attendees

Satish Babu  
Sarmad Hussain  
Jim DeLaHunt  
Mark Datysgeld

### Meeting Agenda:

1. Welcome and roll call.
2. Follow-up on “Bringing UA issues in the attention of U.S. government’s agency (CISA) that is working on software bill of materials  
<https://www.cisa.gov/sbom>”
3. Update on the code snippets and request for review on the reports.  
<https://github.com/icann/universal-acceptance>
4. [T5-UA challenges and survey](#)
  - a) Ranking the answer (see example for [B1 question](#) / [pre-filled form](#))
  - b) Having a complete set of answers for the survey in the form.
5. AOB

### Meeting Recording:

[https://icann.zoom.us/rec/play/U\\_5-tYTXMQPK71q8IO3BvyjTZbqQX36UZvCMNmjzdexRKz0YykNt1LiqhCgfikHEctHjYpRnhMaf3JPw.Zr11IP3R0BVJ5msh?continueMode=true](https://icann.zoom.us/rec/play/U_5-tYTXMQPK71q8IO3BvyjTZbqQX36UZvCMNmjzdexRKz0YykNt1LiqhCgfikHEctHjYpRnhMaf3JPw.Zr11IP3R0BVJ5msh?continueMode=true)  
Passcode: RrWM\$LM1pV

### Meeting Notes

Sarmad took the roll call and welcomed all the members. Satish said that there will be no Tech calls in September because of the ICANN meeting.

Satish said that interesting discussions are going on regarding testing of programming languages and frameworks which Cofomo presented in the previous meeting. We may need to adopt a strategy around having a reasonable degree of

our code being accepted by the community or the group before commissioning the code. This requires some discussion in this group.

He said that first we have to follow-up on what was proposed about the software bill of material (SBOM) by Christian Dawson. He said that the question is whether we should join the initiative. And if we join it, what is the work that we have to do and deliver on this and also we have to see that it should be practical and feasible. Satish asked for Sarmad's input.

Sarmad said that there are two main items here:

- 1) The first is that there are various guidelines like this in the world. He said that he has reached out to the technical team within ICANN who pointed out at least one of the initiatives like this within IETF for Europe. He said that there was a suggestion that even Europe, EU may be looking into something similar. He shared that we can start from SBOM but considering that we should look at this thing more broadly for other guidelines.
- 2) Sarmad said the second point is that these are very extensive kinds of standards. He said that if someone wants to make any contribution they would really have to understand what the scope of this work is and how UA fits into this work, or if it fits at all. He said that this is currently a suggestion that we are looking into. Sarmad said that we have to determine if UA fits into the SBOM framework. He said that engagement and understanding is the second thing that needs to be done. These points were communicated with the tech team but he hasn't heard back yet.

Satish said that we have never approached this problem from a cybersecurity angle. Satish shared that SBOM is talking about software bill of materials to avoid supply chain attacks. He said that they are examining deficiencies of each package and to ensure that dependencies are well known. Satish said that at some point cybersecurity may become important and by cooperating with SBOM we can make sure that our code is not carrying any threats.

Mark D. said that SBOM doesn't seem to be open to the discussion in terms of what should be in actual recommendations and materials. He said that UASG's role will be more defensive than prescriptive. He said that he is having many discussions about pre-flagging EAI as spam or displaying lowered trustworthiness ratings in spam evaluation.

Satish said that we need to find out more about what it entails and what kind of workload we are looking at here. Satish suggested meeting with Christian in Kuala Lumpur at ICANN75.

Jim said that we are not really concerned about cybersecurity at UASG. We are more looking into from the customer point of view to make the software work for the customers' email addresses and domain names. There is a risk we may be rejected because we are distracting them from their real purpose. Jim suggested that for success we will have to designate an individual or two who will go to all the meetings, and we may need to allocate some budget for this. Jim said that we have to focus on forming a structure so that we can participate in somebody else's WG.

Sarmad said that it's not really a hardcore cybersecurity problem, but it can be potentially important, and gave an example about the usage of regular expressions. We know that regular expressions are not the right way of processing emails securely, for checking whether something is a valid email address or not. So that might be one of the things we may want to fix, or use validation. There is a scope for our contribution there. Sarmad said that this particular group is focused on a broad angle of security. And the way to make a change is to engage with them with a person who has a broader cybersecurity understanding along with the UA topics so that we can have a long term engagement. That part is a challenge.

Sarmad said that there is also an idea which involves other places. And we don't want UASG seen as engaging with just one and not others. Satish agreed with Sarmad. Satish said that we need a person who can understand both sides in order to make this work. He said that participating in a program like this will help us to produce a safer code. In future **we should consider the cybersecurity side of the code we produce and do the audits accordingly so that we can widely push the code to relevant organizations.**

Satish moved to agenda no 3. Sarmad said that we are at the point where we are concluding this piece of work which we had commissioned. Sarmad explained the codes are available for android, java, javascript, and python. We published a report available on GitHub repository and we would want UA Tech WG to review it and sign off on it. So we can publish the report and close this project.

Satish said that we have seen the demos in earlier meetings so this is just the matter of closing all the loose ends. Satish asked whether the WG needs to check it works or the underline running code. Sarmad responded to this and said that the intention of this code is to demonstrate how to use these libraries for IDN or EAI validation. Eventually the idea is to show how to configure these libraries. Sarmad said that this is developed for UASG so if we want we can make a mechanism to check it otherwise we trust Cofomo's competence who has developed this code.

Satish said that we need to validate the report and we need some time for it. Jim suggested passing it to developers. Sarmad said that the report has been sent and the link to GitHub was sent through the agenda which was circulated. Sarmad said that he will request Seda to share the report link again. Satish said please ask if anyone has any comments, and Sarmad said ok.

Jim shared some suggestions in the chat:

1. This repository is named "Universal Acceptance". That is a very universal name. What happens when we want to publish a second repository of UA sample code? Consider making the repository name more specific.
2. The README.md text contains no references to the UASG report number, Statement of Work, or related materials. It would be helpful to have those references.
3. Re making this work visible: Our catalogue of UA resources is <https://uasg.tech/document-hub/> . Can we find a way to add links to GitHub into this page?
4. Most UASG materials are reference materials. Developers will not be interested in them when we publish it, they will be interested later, when their work makes it relevant. Thus we need to find ways to make our materials discoverable, especially

via web search and via UASG.tech browsing. A blog post is a chance to create search targets which lead to the resource.

Satish responded to Jim's comment and said that it should definitely connect with the rest of the documentation on the UASG website so the reference is clear. Also he said that **if we used a very generic name on Github repo as universal acceptance, the search engine may not bring it when code snippets are searched. Jim suggested a blog post that is a chance to create search targets which lead to the resource.**

Mark D agreed on Jim's points. He shared his views regarding the publication process of the code snippets that needs to be done in a different way to make relevant business organizations be aware of. Satish responded to Mark's suggestion and said that we have to think about how to publicize it among people and how to push it further.

Sarmad said that normally we **incorporate this type of technical training** which we develop for UA. We will have to develop a complete set of training materials with lab components. Sarmad said that we should work to see how to get this to the developer's community. Social media targeted campaigns, or reaching out developers on Github and Serverfault, and some of these other places might also be considered.

Satish said this requires some coordinated work and Comms WG might have some suggestions. He said that waiting for training will not be sufficient. Sarmad said that Comms WG did a social media campaign about another UASG report, which was very helpful so they can certainly do something like that for this. But some suggestions from this WG will be very helpful for Comms WG. Satish agreed with Sarmad and said that we need all the publicity we can get.

Satish said that we have to make sure that our offerings are easy to track down. Mark said that we have added a lot of metadata to the actual documents which will be very helpful. Satish asked Sarmad about the announcement. Sarmad said that normally we do an announcement or a blog. Satish said that we will think it over and come up with a method and go ahead with that.

Satish moved to agenda topic#4. He said that the survey topic has run into a bit of a problem. Satish shared that he has been looking into survey tools but all of them are paid tools. He said that we wanted the feature of ranking through drag and drop but it does not have a free version. He said that there are some free versions but they lack the ability to export the data into anything sensible. He said that there is a workaround in Google Form but it's somewhat clumsy and complicated. He noted that we have to make sure that data can be tabulated.

Satish asked Seda if we can use surveymonkey account of ICANN, if any. But ICANN does not have a license for surveymonkey. Instead, she suggested clicktools which is integrated in Salesforce, but does not look user friendly and looks harder to do the ranking..

Jim said that he will try to come up with a survey but it will not be where you drag the answers into the right order and explained the features of the survey. Satish said that Jim can let us know whether this is reasonably friendly in terms of user experience, without losing the semantics of ranking. Satish said that all the suggestions by Jim on the survey questions are acceptable. It's just not being incorporated yet because we don't know which tool we will use and therefore avoided duplicate effort until it's clear which tool we choose.

Jim said that we need a good set of answers to get a good set of data. He asked about the people who should review the list of answers and help perfect that list. Satish said that UA Tech WG, but WG will be very inactive so the people on this call and Seda will be responsible for finalizing the answer. Satish said that we can start working on this in the email. Satish said that maybe Seda will share the questions in a word document so we can discuss them and come up with a consensus in the email itself before we can move it to the form. Jim agreed.

Satish thanked everyone for their time and input. He said that we will discuss these things over email and will have our next meeting on 10 October.

**Next meeting:** Monday 10<sup>th</sup> October 2022 at 16:00 UTC

**Action items**

No	Action Item	Owner
1	Work on questions for the tool	All
2	Change the Github repo name for code snippets, add keywords to document hub for the search engines	Seda
3	Create a blog for the code snippets that is easy to locate via search engines	Seda / Comms WG
4	Come up with a feasibility of Google form, and demo of ranking method in Google form	Jim
5	Incorporate Jim's suggestions on the survey when the survey tool is chosen	Satish
6	Share the survey questions and answers in a word documents for Tech WG's inputs	Seda