

# UA Technology WG Meeting

07 November 2022

## Attendees

Satish Babu  
Jim DeLaHunt  
Sushanta Sinha  
Hafiz Farooq  
Vadim Mikhaylov  
Yin May Oo  
Seda Akbulut

## Meeting Agenda:

1. Welcome and Roll Call
2. Clicktools and google forms  
[T5 – UA challenges and survey\[docs.google.com\]](#)
  1. Demo of potential ranking tools (see example for [B1 question](#) / [pre-filled form](#) in Google; mockup survey in [clicktools](#))
  2. Having a complete set of answers for the survey in the form
3. Review the comments on  
[https://docs.google.com/document/d/1LKxvRyTOufM\\_lgguTuat\\_iu5zc7-ckibuvrvis1Vp2c/edit](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1LKxvRyTOufM_lgguTuat_iu5zc7-ckibuvrvis1Vp2c/edit)
4. AOB

## Meeting Recording

## Meeting Notes

Satish Babu starts the meeting by saying that it was great to see everyone again at the meeting after the long break since the August meeting.

Satish let every working group member know about the removal of item number 4 (previously) from the agenda list, which was about the next action item that the

Tech WG needs to work on. This will be added to the next meeting's agenda as it will be discussed with Sarmad.

Satish asked Seda to do the demo on the clicktools survey. Seda showed the survey screen to get feedback to improve the survey and then to collect the test data to analyze whether it is sufficient for us to use for expert consultation.

Jim said the survey did not load in the Firefox browser. Seda added that it was only tested in Safari and Chrome. Satish asked which platform each participant was using, Windows, Mac or Linux. Sushanta answered that he was on Android. Seda gave feedback on the survey form that one text field was significantly larger than the rest.

Feedback on the survey:

- Satish said that there should be a title of the survey at the beginning. Seda said this can be copied from the Google survey form.
- Jim had issues downloading the page in Firefox in Canada. But that issue was resolved after a while. Seda said it worked in Safari and Chrome.
- Text feature needs to be fixed to show the input fields more properly. This can be fixed by using an Essay type of input field. (Q1 should be essay type)
- We need to see other options to find out what else can be done to make it look better.
- Satish suggested "the name of the person" can be optional. Satish asked what questions might clash with personal data or which questions might be sensitive, and asked for advice to avoid what kind of questions. There was feedback about past experiences, background information to be left as optional.
- Hafiz added that we can ask about the past experience of UA after the name information.
- Jim expressed concerns that UA terms could be misunderstood by the general public and questions might create ambiguity. Jim suggested using 'Internationalized domain names and email addresses (Universal Acceptance)' to make the question sounds

- relatable. Jim suggested using “universal acceptance” as all lowercase to avoid confusion with organizations and other concepts.
- Jim also suggested spelling out UASG as “Universal Acceptance Steering Group community” to make sure which is the community, which is the organization and which is the project for the surveyees. Terminology precision is important for first impressions for the people to hear of UA for the first time.
  - Jim continued asking what would be the name of the whole community since UASG only refers to the leadership group since the main website is [UASG.tech](https://uasg.tech). Satish confirms that using the term “Universal Acceptance Steering Group community” is safe and clear. Jim highlighted that the terminology for what is activity, what is the organization and what is the community is important to be differentiable for the newcomers. Satish agreed.
  - Although Q10 is mandatory, without ranking you can still submit.
  - Q11 will be a ranking option if the data is captured correctly. For Q11, Seda said this compulsory question was accepting the answers unranked, it is needed for the surveyee to rank the options. Satish and Seda were finding ways to design the question to make it rankable. It currently accepts the default ranking as an answer when submitted. If the question was made compulsory, the order may need to be changed at least once.

Satish continued to get feedback on the survey form from the working group. Allowing surveyees to select one or more multiple-choice answers, setting maximum values, or adding personal options were tested. Jim went back to his initial feedback of not being able to load the survey form on the Firefox browser that he could load the survey form. Jim explained that then the problem could be due to internet connection issues.

Moving on, Jim wrote in the chat about the Question.8 bug

- When I select the answer “Other” for Q8, then a Q9 appears “Other - primary affiliation within the ICANN community” with a text box. I

must put something in that text box, even if I go back to Q8 and change my response to “None of the above”.

Also asked if the information asked in Q8 is required or useful in any ways. Satish said this is to know the demographics of surveyees. And the bug is fixed for the none-option.

- We also want to see how the data appears in the Csv file. So, for that we need some data.  
Data after submission for the rank question is shown as follows.

10. Section 3 of 4 B. Universal Acceptance: The Core IssuesB1: In your opinion, which of the following statements are most relevant?							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	Rank
End-users are unaware of the issues	3	0	0	0	0	0	1
UA does not impact a majority of e	0	1	1	1	0	0	2=
End-users are unaware of the potential	0	1	1	1	0	0	2=
Even in multilingual geographies,	0	1	0	1	0	1	4
A UA-ready Internet will lead to significant	0	0	1	0	2	0	5
A UA-ready Internet enhances trust	0	0	0	0	0	1	6
(Response: 3)							

- Jim asked whether we need the information from Q8. He inquired how it helped us. He also stated that there is a bug in Q8: When we select the answer “Other” for Q8, then a Q9 appears “Other - primary affiliation within ICANN community” with a text box. One must put something in that text box, even if we go back to Q8 and change my response to “None of the above”.
- Hafiz asked about Q10, some options are similar to each other, if they could be combined. Satish answered that these questions were crafted according to the discussions of other working groups and it would be alright to leave them as they are. There would be final reviewing of the questions in the same working group after the survey form design is finalized.
- Vadim suggested changing the answers in Q11, where it mentioned considerable market opportunities, and all answers should be aligned as negative, by adding No to this statement: "There is NO

considerable market opportunity..."? Because all other statements have negative meaning from UA perspective and only this one is positive. He added that "There is NO considerable market opportunity" is correct. All the options are statements of why companies reject UA. That is the polarity which the word "NO" tries to preserve.

Satish said universal acceptance is several billion users market opportunity and it depends on how the business people would look at it. Satish also mentioned that market opportunities could be put under negative light and let people see many rooms to be improved. Jim agreed with Vadim that Q11 gave reasons why universal acceptance would be rejected. So Jim suggested that one way is to keep all options negative and let surveyees decide which one is worse than others, or the other option is to balance the options which favors or disfavor the universal acceptance. Satish said we were aware that businesses are not investing to close the UA gap yet. Satish agreed to rephrase some of the option sentences to give it a balanced mix of positive and negative reasons.

- Jim shared that we can also simplify the statements. Eg. For Q11 response 1, there are two ideas connected: "Businesses are reluctant" and "unsure if there will be sufficient returns". We should simplify to just "unsure if there will be sufficient returns". Don't include "Businesses are reluctant".
- For Q12, Satish said we may need more information on this. Jim suggested using a ranking-type question and Satish agreed saying businesses are unsure if investments will produce substantial returns, thus, better to give rank-up rank-down options to see what to prioritize.
- Jim shared that ranking and multiselection have the same objective, to put options in an order. He believes that ranking will achieve this objective better than multiselection will.
- Seda asked to confirm what type of question Q11 would be. There were options of ranking type and selecting the top three. Hafiz agreed with Jim's comment which said ranking type would be more

valuable than selecting the top three, since ranking would be more relatable to the people. Satish agreed.

- Jim shared that the exact choice and wording of answer options in Q10-Q14 are absolutely essential to make this survey useful. We should spend most of our preparation time editing these options.
- Jim suggested moving Q1-Q9 to the end of the survey, under a heading “About the respondent” or “Demographics” etc. Let’s allow our respondents to get to work right away with the most interesting part of the survey.
- Jim shared that he knows of a way to analyse ranking results. It comes from election methods. It is called Single Transferable Vote (STV): [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Single\\_transferable\\_vote](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Single_transferable_vote). He has tools to do this kind of analysis.

Sushanta suggested that in terms of analysis after getting the data, after we know what the items would be, we would like to know which is the most important option for the people and which is the least. For this, ranking would be better. Meeting participants discussed how to read the answers of ranked questions. Jim said he would help analyze the survey results. Seda would share the collected results (raw data) to the working group so the members could help analyze the data. Satish requested the meeting attendees to participate in the survey, and the survey should be wrapped up in the next meeting.

Topic for next meeting, capture the comments in the survey questions, and what to take up next from the action plan – ask Sarmad to join for an action plan topic.

**Next meeting:** Monday 05 December 2022 at 16:00 UTC

### Action items

No	Action Item	Owner
1	Submit test data and share input on the survey	Tech WG
2	Update the answers on Q11 based on Vadim’s and Jim’s comment and other comments on <a href="https://docs.google.com/document/d/1LKxvRyTOufM_lggTuat_iu5zc7-ckibuvrvis1Vp2c/edit">https://docs.google.com/document/d/1LKxvRyTOufM_lggTuat_iu5zc7-ckibuvrvis1Vp2c/edit</a>	Satish

3	Update the survey on clicktools based on the inputs	Seda
---	---	------