

UA Tech WG Meeting Notes

17 July 2023

Attendees

Satish Babu

Jim DeLaHunt

John Levine

Anil Kumar Jain

Harsha Wijayawardhana

Benjamin Akinmoyeje

Harve Hounzandji

Henrietta Ampofo

Mohammad Abdul Haque Anu

Samwel Kariuki

Sanoussi Baahe Dadde

Seda Akbulut

Meeting Agenda:

1. T5 Survey finalization ([shared doc](#) for final comments; updated survey <https://icann.getfeedback.com/r/d0KrFwns>)
 1. finalizing the email notification and questions
 2. list of people to send out the survey
 3. identify the response time
2. Quick update: UASG046 Website Remediation Study, commissioned by Tech WG, was released
3. Having a consensus at UASG on the validation of email addresses.
AI: start drafting a policy as UASG recommendation on email ID validations
4. Getting ideas to define any problem set for the technical audience and university students to solve in local hackathons.
5. Reviewing [feedback](#) from EAI WG on EAI related action items. (T2 is more prior than T3)

Meeting Recording: [Link](#) , password <XV.q^N0=Y4>

Meeting Notes

Seda presented the meeting agenda and reminded the first agenda item- T5 is the action item from FY23, brought forward.

#1 - T5 (Survey format)

Satish asked for any other community input on survey questions before moving on to the surveyee list. Previous inputs from the community were taken and the document is almost ready. Satish highlighted the purpose of the survey and concerns.

Henrietta asked to clarify the target group of the surveyee. Satish explained that the survey for this phase is aimed at about 40 people who are well aware of universal acceptance, the short-listed people are mostly the UA experts and community members of UASG. The results from the first phase survey would be used to design another set of surveys, which is targeted to more broad groups of people such as tech developers, corporates and governments.

Jim added that shared understanding of strategic situations would help. Identifying the biggest challenges, strengths and obstacles of UA is the first goal to solve the problems and get closer to universal acceptance. The aim of the survey in this first issue will be to give us a better understanding of strategic situations with strengths.

Since there were no more comments, Satish requested updating the main survey based on this document and setting out. Satish asked if there is a need to do pilot testing for this. Seda would work with Satish before releasing the final version of the survey to the surveyee.

Question A4:

Satish suggested adding ICANN and ICANN Board to the response options. Seda confirmed that this can be added offline after checking internally. Jim had commented to drop this question. However, Satish provided the rationale in keeping this question. Jim agreed. It was decided to keep A4.

C2: To simplify the survey, Jim suggested not keeping this question on prior stakeholders. Previously J Levine suggested this could be looked into from time to time. Satish stated that it wouldn't make much difference to remove this question.

Jim discussed some final concerns on the wordings of the questionnaire, and reflected in the updated document and the questionnaire set.

B2:

It was decided to keep the question B2. But the “businesses” and “tech companies” wording in the answers were replaced with “technology service providers”. Seda will update this change in the survey.

B6: As per Jim’s former comment below a new question with B6 code decided to be added.:

"Missing survey page: we do not have a page asking about perceptions of "businesses", as the main participants in economies whether or not their products are technical. We have only "Tech Companies". Suggest copying the "Tech Companies" page and rewording it to be about "businesses" in general."

Satish asked Seda to send an email to Jim and Satish to work on the B6 question to ask perception of businesses/industry. While question B2 is for tech suppliers, the new question B6 will be for the driver of demand.

Seda will incorporate the changes in the survey and send it out to the WG for final review before the next meeting.

#1 - Adding more surveyees

Mohammad Anu requested to be added as a surveyee as he is involved in ccTLD in Bangladesh. Satish said since this survey is supposed to be for the familiar-with-UA community, M. Anu should share his background and UA contributions to the mailing list as an introduction.

Harsha was also requested to share with more tech-community people who are familiar with email services, universal acceptance, and internationalization.

Satish asked to list the surveyees in alphabetical order. Seda clarified that the survey would be sent separately to them. But in any case, she will list the surveyees in alphabetical order.

Survey process: Regarding the participation process, and response time, Satish shared that 30% participation would be ok. We will give surveyees 2 weeks to respond. At the end of 1st week, we will remind them to participate if they haven't not participated yet, and then we will give one more week.

#2 - UASG046

Seda updated that the UA Remediation report is now published on the UASG.tech website. Last time the report was a shorter version, and now, more details and stories are included in the report. Seda thanked the Tech WG for comprehensive reviewing, discussions, and giving feedback.

#3 – Validation methods

Satish asked for an expert opinion from John Levine. To John, it is a long standing myth. John said that the only way to validate an email address is to send it to a mail and see if it gets an answer. And it is the same for IDNs. John shared that he doesn't think we can find anything useful. Satish paraphrased his saying we cannot find anything feasible to validate through regex.

John added that there are services that aim to validate e-mail addresses. And all they do is look for spam traps. He recommends avoiding such services that only look for spam traps.

Jim referred to UASG046, p. 33, and suggested coming up with a reformulation on this verbiage.

“Regex pattern:

```
/^([<>()[]\.,;:~\s@"]+(\.[<>()[]\.,;:~\s@"]+)*|(\."+\s@"]+\.)+[<>()[]\.,;:~\s@"]{2,})$/i
```

This regular expression checks for the following basic email address requirements:

- The local part (before the @ symbol) can contain any characters except for specific special characters (<, >, (,), [,], ,, ;, :, \s, @, and "). Quoted local parts are also allowed.

- The domain part (after the @ symbol) must have at least one dot and be followed by at least two characters (TLD).

- The regular expression is case-insensitive (i flag at the end).

Please note that email address validation is a complex task, and it is difficult to achieve 100% accuracy with a regular expression alone. Email address formats can vary, and there are some edge cases that may not be covered by this basic pattern. It is recommended to combine regular expressions with server-side validation and additional checks to ensure thorough email address validation.”

Jim said there was a vendor advice on filtering email addresses using some regular expression pattern. Jim shared his opinion that this is bad advice. UASG should clearly write down a technical opinion or a policy on validating email addresses incorporating John’s opinion. Whenever we commission a study, we should give this document to a vendor, and ask them to create a study in line with this paper. This would be to prevent future vendors giving suggestions on filtering some emails based on regex patterns.

Satish added that if no one can validate the email addresses properly, then we can take a look at the standards bodies, such as WHATWG. HTML standards do have an email validation - HTML5 input types of email- but this is not for IDN validations.

John said that there is no validation method beyond the fact that it has to have an [@] and [.] signs. Anything that meets this requirement would be valid. Other than that, it would be hard to advise what are the codepoints to disallow while receiving the webform. W3C has an expression where they recommend the webforms using regex but also admit that does not match the specs, and do not allow non-ASCII email addresses. All in all, the validation doesn’t work.

Harsha agreed with John’s concern where some webforms do not accept internationalized email addresses, and added he experienced the same problem for Sri Lanka email addresses.

Satish summarized that rather than saying validation, it may be put as “well-formedness” (that looks like an email ID) and “validity”.

Benjamin said he is interested in the paper writing task (for email validation) also suggests bringing academics into conversation. Satish said academic

perspective would be appreciated, and more ideas from other WG members should be added to start progress.

#4 - Local initiatives are to organize on events such as UA day or others

This is for getting ideas to define any problem set for the technical audience and university students to solve in local hackathons. The topic was added to the agenda after an email received from LACNOC to Tech WG about the hackathon ideas.

Mohammad Anu has a question on how to organize a hackathon. Seda answered that UASG and ICANN are always offering technical materials and solution suggestions. When it comes to #4, the discussion is on what set of challenges to be included in the hackathons. There are many UA related matters to be handled in hackathons. For those who would like to organize a hackathon, what sets of problems Tech WG can suggest so that they can be solved. This is for this Tech WG to discuss and recommend. Seda presented the hackathon [Case Study](#) on the UASG.tech website. There are documentations of solving issues and links to repositories that can be used in hackathons.

Anil shared that Edmon Chung has undertaken a UA project for dotAsia. This could be adapted for either local or regional events.

Satish suggested creating a common interest team for Hackathon, to start answering questions from different WGs having the similar concerns over organizing a hackathon.

AOB - unknown participant

There was an unknown account joining the meeting, the account name ended with [.ai] and Jim and Satish asked for any policy to make sure to prevent this. Seda shared that only real people can join the meeting. Hence the ai tool was removed from the room. Seda shared that the machine transcript by Zoom is available along with the zoom recording. The meeting notes are also shared after the meetings on <https://community.icann.org/display/TUA/UA-Technology+WG>.

The agenda items for the next meeting will be the non-completed items from this week:

1. T5 Survey finalization
2. Write up a technical opinion and a policy about email/ IDN validations
3. Getting ideas to define any problem set for the technical audience and university students to solve in local hackathons.
4. Reviewing [feedback](#) from EAI WG on EAI related action items. (T2 is more prior than T3)

Next Meeting: 31 July 2023, Monday 14:30 UTC

Action Items:

No	Action Item	Owner
1	Provide an additional question (B6) about businesses to the survey	Satish, Jim
2	Convey the message to the Coordination WG on identifying unknown accounts joining zoom with *.ai	Seda
3	Publish a technical opinion or a policy opinion on email address validation.	Tech WG in line with EAI WG.