

# UA Technology WG Meeting

## 19 December 2022

### Attendees

Satish Babu

Jim DeLaHunt

Prince Andrew Livingstone Zutah

Julien Bernard

Sushanta Sinha

Shadrach Ankrah

Samwel Kariuki

Arnt Gulbrandsen

Yin May Oo

Seda Akbulut

### Meeting Agenda:

1. Welcome and Roll Call
2. What to take up next from the [FY23 Action Plan](#)
  - List of ongoing and completed tasks that can be used for future remediation
  - Reviewing the red/yellow ones in the UASG037 table (page4-5)
  - Inputs on the [SAC070 Document](#)
0. Review the comments on [https://docs.google.com/document/d/1LKxvRyTOufM\\_IgguTuat\\_iu5zc7-ckibuvrvis1Vp2c/edit](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1LKxvRyTOufM_IgguTuat_iu5zc7-ckibuvrvis1Vp2c/edit), clean the document, review the survey and draft an email for inviting to the survey participation
0. AOB

### [Meeting Recording](#)

### Meeting Notes

The meeting started with going through the FY23 action plan document by Satish. Seda recapped the previous meeting and discussions, so that Satish could pick up from where it was left last time.

Satish said the survey would be sent out by January, new year. Satish continued that from the FY23 document, some items should be picked up to work on.

**T1** is ongoing and does not require discussion.

**T2.1** is code fragments, which has been published and required publicity. Seda explained that the codes are on Github repository and Comms group has been doing a social media campaign to promote it. Now these are integrated with training materials for the next step. Satish considered that T2.1 is done.

**T2.2** is for content management related solutions for websites, CMS (Content Management System), which may be similar to T2.1, but there are differences. T2.1 is codes of libraries and languages frameworks, and T2.2 is for web content and web engines. Satish said we could start doing this task right away and prioritize the action items based on the initial outcome from Web-based businesses. **Satish asked if we should focus on T2.2 as a high priority task.** Jim questioned to clarify the difference between T2.1 and T2.2. Satish answered that T2.2 is more about managing web platforms to manage contents in a UA-friendly way. Satish said we can focus on well known CMS platforms such as Wordpress. There are technical concerns that there is a possibility that by the time we provide resolution for Wordpress, they may have a new release. So instead of that, it makes more sense to **develop a Plugin for Wordpress that enables UA.** It would be better to know what is the backend of CMS, otherwise, we would be dealing with black boxes.

Jim suggested that T2.2 could be the first thing to do, and would like to see down the list before deciding whether T2.2 be the high priority item.

**T3** is to conduct technology remediation for websites, which is to build a website, whereas T2.2 is about maintaining existing websites and also supporting UA. Seda said T3 has two phases and the first phase, UASG039 has been completed, and the second phase is to be completed by 2023 January. An email campaign was also conducted to reach out to website management platforms which are yet to be UA ready. There were not many responses, so we needed to change the strategy, collaboration with developer communities and conduct hackathons to

build more UA ready websites. Once the vendor has done their part, the next step will be announced. This is not a technology problem, but a management decision. Satish said from our side, we have to persuade Web business stakeholders to have UA awareness and join towards the UA goals. Based on the response of the email campaign, we can take in mind how far we have to go. So we will plan the next step after 2023 January. Seda said the work done on T2.2 may shine some light for T3. Satish said T2.2 may have some limitations due to unknown backend technologies and the platforms they are using. However, we should do something to show them what could be done.

Regarding the top 2000 websites test and outreach, Jim mentioned possibilities that they would not care about our message, or they cared to listen to us but disagree with remediation, and then, it would be interesting if the third possibility would be they would like to cooperate but we may not know how. Seda added that the vendor is sending out a survey to the 2000 websites to understand what their background is and how they can work together to make their websites UA ready. So the support is available if the developers or management agree. Satish said it could be that the business people may appreciate UA but technology people may not prioritize it. All we can do is send our messages first and see their changes on their side. We need to see the gap clearly to fix it with different approaches.

**T4** about training material is ongoing work which is related to T2.1 and it does not require much direct input yet. There was no further comment on T4.

**T5** is ongoing with a survey.

**T6** is about **UASG040, something we definitely have to do this year**. Satish asked if T6 or T2.2 could be prioritized for this year. We need to decide which one would be prioritized but still need to work on both of them.

**T7** is academia outreach. Seda said the measurement group is working on this and the call for proposals for the SOW was published, the proposal deadline is by the end of January, and then we would start the evaluation process.

**T8** is about UA day and updated UA day would be Mar 28, 2023. Satish said the UA day activity plans look like there are two parts, one is mobilizing stakeholders to get the concept of UA, and the other is capacity building for different communities which is not only about website remediation but also on getting attention from business and tech communities. We would like to create a buzz to get attention from multiple stakeholders who have influence in closing the gaps. **Members of this Tech WG may be invited to speak in some of the UA events, or we could volunteer and give the names to UA Coordination WG,** to add technical perspective to UA readiness solutions. Seda said interested speakers for UA day events could directly email to the working group mailing list or “**info@uasg.tech**”.

Jim said the large meeting going to happen in India is going to be a big influence. Other regional or local events might be more like grassroots. Jim expressed his hope to have many UA day events in local levels all over the place with local initiatives (LIs). Satish said it is absolutely possible, and everyone is waiting for an announcement and confirmed allowance. One local hackathon event is coming up in Egypt where Abdalmonem is managing. Different LIs would independently do UA day events by just using the documents provided on “[uasg.tech/uaday](https://uasg.tech/uaday)”. Jim asked which part of UASG would lead on coordinating the UA day events. Seda answered that the UA Day Working Group consists of UASG Coordination WG members (Admin WG and other WG chairs) and UA Ambassadors and liaisons from SOs and ACs.

Jim commented that if the goal is to have many grassroots activities, the work of UA Day WG would be low profiled. **He suggested that a better way to get a lot of UA day grassroots activities is the organizers communicating the vision of UA day and making it visible, so that the people are more aware of the idea and step forward to do something.** For example, having a webpage which communicates the vision, mission, sharing resources and event announcements would be encouraging. Jim’s second suggestion is that as a technological working group, **a list of speakers can be prepared and share basic technical information about**

**universal acceptance, this Tech WG could provide a lot for grassroots meetings, local UA day events around the world.**

Seda commented that we have the UASG.tech website to share about these events, and people would be able to see approved proposals and organized activities. **She welcomed the suggestion of the list of speakers and recommended checking the upcoming activities to see which event would be suitable to support as a speaker.** Not all events would have the same agenda, some would be more on technical training and some would be more on awareness, so it would be good to have more exposure. Satish said **we might need many non-English speakers like Spanish, Portuguese or French.** Satish would give the list of speakers to Seda.

Satish also asked about a Flyer for UA Day and would like to contribute some technological perspectives. Satish asked the members to forward their comments and suggestions on UA Day to [info@uasg.tech](mailto:info@uasg.tech) email or [ua-tech@icann.org](mailto:ua-tech@icann.org) mailing list.

Updates on the events would be published on the UA website. **Satish said the current website has announcements only in English, it would be good to support a few more languages and accept proposals in more languages than English-only as well, this could be improved for inclusivity.**

Seda said the advice is well noted, and UA Day is at the very beginning stage, and this will also link to the internet for all. There would be some outreach to local initiatives, SOs and ACs and relevant parties to come and contribute, the outreach letters are prepared.

### **Additional topic - Public Suffix List (PSL)**

The issue has to do with the Public Suffix List. Turns out that most browsers (Chrome, Firefox, Opera, etc.) use the PSL to determine whether a name typed in the search bar is a domain or a search term: [https://publicsuffix.org/learn/\[publicsuffix.org\]](https://publicsuffix.org/learn/[publicsuffix.org]) So if one implements a new IDN, most browsers will not recognize it and will assume it is a search term. It was encountered when trying to open up an IDN ccTLD domain name, and had to delay by 2 months until the PSL was updated and integrated into all browsers.

Satish said this challenge was forwarded from ISOC, saying that several browsers use a static list to convert text to links internally, and the problem is when you input an IDN domain name, it does not directly connect. Arnt said it usually takes less than two months. Jim said that for PSL it is worth reading the SAC070 paper to find out what it is, and why it is there.

<https://www.icann.org/resources/files/1190375-2015-05-29-en> leads to <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-070-en.pdf>

Jim explained that a software which uses domain names needs to have a suffix list to have some way of knowing what domains contain other domains. Whoever maintains the list must have universal acceptance in mind. When the list seems not well updated, it seems to have problems, but not necessarily a UA related problem. Arnt agreed.

Julien referred to IETF request IETF BOF request – If the bug is accepted there will be a WG to make it more dynamic. <https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/bofreq-williams-domain-boundaries/> He added that if WG accepts this bug, since it is somewhat related to IDNs, it would help in a way for UA readiness. Satish thanked Julien and shared his opinion that **this item does not seem to relate to UA problems and to be excluded from current year 2023's action items.** We may spare some time to look deeper into this. Arnt agreed.

### **Agenda item #3**

Satish discussed the survey, and shared that the new survey tool for the year 2023 was almost finalized thanks to Seda. Previous survey tool, Clicktools, is no longer supported by ICANN. Hence there is a new survey tool called Getfeedback, which looks better and more functional in terms of ranking the answers. The draft survey questions are in GoogleForm format and received comments from Jim about questionnaire orders. Seda said the edits were done according to suggestions, and demonstrated the survey tool briefly. The draft version was well received. More updates will be done in terms of sharing the survey and distributing the links.

## Additional Action Items from UASG’s meeting with ICANN BIUWG (Board IDN UA WG) and ICANN org

Tech Working Group is considered by the Coordination WG to take up some of the action items of UASG as a follow up on our meetings with ICANN board and org. In this meeting, we had no time to discuss the action items. Therefore, their content is included here for future reference.

### Action Items from UASG’s meeting with ICANN BIUWG and ICANN org:

- a) UASG to look into the impact of IDN Variant TLDs on UA. (assigned to UA-TECH)  
 IDN variant TLDs may have an impact on UA. UASG has not considered this topic yet. However, UASG will start looking into the UA challenges which may be caused by IDN variant domain names and get back to BIUWG.
  
- b) UASG to explore UA-readiness by the next new gTLD round and how UA could impact the next round. (Assigned to UA Tech and UA Measurement)

Next meeting date and time will be announced later.

**Next meeting:** Monday (TBD) January 2022 at 16:00 UTC

### Action items

No	Action Item	Owner
1	Send comments or suggestions about UA day to <a href="mailto:info@uasg.tech">info@uasg.tech</a> email or <a href="mailto:ua-tech@icann.org">ua-tech@icann.org</a> mailing list.	Tech WG
2	Share a list of non-English (ICANN languages) speakers to Seda by Name/ Language /Interested Events	Satish / Tech WG
3	Send the UASG’s action items to the ua-tech mailing list	Seda