

UA Tech WG Meeting Notes

05 February 2024

Attendees

Satish Babu

Abdulkarim Oloyede

Dr. Adebunmi Adeola Akinbo

Ali Hussain

Benjamin Akinmoyeje

Chilufya Theresa Mulenga

Jim DeLaHunt

Krislin Goulbourne-Harry

Letsatsi Lekhooa

Setondji Herve Hounzandji

Shamima Akhter

Seda Akbulut

Meeting Agenda:

1. Welcome and roll call
2. Signing off the [5-year action plan](#) for Tech WG to achieve the [UASG's 5-year strategic plan](#) (see comments <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1oAOjT8G0Abk64WZGYctiaTwCfsqArRplABVqsJASPyo/edit>)
3. Reviewing the UA Strategy [Survey Results](#) and discuss how to narrate and what to include in the report before publishing.
4. AOB

Meeting Recording: [Link](#) , Password NA

Meeting Notes

Satish started the meeting with the priority of finalizing the 5-year action plan. Seda presented and shared the 5-year plan [document](#) for the Tech WG on reviewing and resolving the comments. In the document, the text in **blue** are the ideas from the tech WG's survey results.

Satish explained that the planning strategy would be more on a bottom-up approach, and less of top-to-down instructions. Each WG would come up with their perspective and work plan to put together.

Satish said the survey also helped discover a few more points beside what WG has done last year. Jim's comment suggested the different approach which would start from the leaders of UASG, however, WGs has committed to the 5-year plan to go forward. Satish said this is how we would go on from the community's perspective. We may not feel a strong sense of direction given by the leadership team, however, we came out with our own plans for remediation and adoption ideas and submitted them to the leadership.

Seda added that once the plan came up with the draft, it would be submitted to the leadership team and communicated with the UASG as a whole. Inputs from the WGs are important for the leadership team to know the matters more thoroughly and support each working group's action items. With these replies, Jim's comment was resolved. Satish suggested saving Jim's comment in the ending of the document as a note.

Comment by Jim for 5-year plan <My personal comment about this document is that it is not a meaningful part of a UASG 5-year plan, because it was produced using a mistaken process. We should start from a UASG-wide plan with a shared understanding of the strategic situation and overall goals, then develop a 5-year plan which is based on that strategy and aims at those goals. Instead this document is a bottom-up idea list narrowly bounded by the working group's internal perspective. I do not expect it to turn into a usable 5-year plan. Instead, I look to UASG leadership to restart the 5-year plan following a better process. I do not claim to speak for the UASG or the Working Group with this comment. If others agree or disagree, they are welcome to make their own comments. —Jim DeLaHunt 2024-01-29>

Jim replied that he just wanted to include his thoughts in the document. Jim shared that the new working groups may be required, and come up with a shared strategic understanding. There is a need for holistic things to happen more than just a matter of a bottom-up process. Jim's comment is not only for the planning of one WG, but rather for the whole UASG in general process. Seda said this comment would be added for the general issues.

Agenda#2: Finalizing the 5-year plan

New Ref 2:

Regarding the issue with Dovecot, Satish said that they were not willing to accept the changes and incorporate those in the source code. They mentioned that the correction cost would be high (six digits) as the correction would not only affect the open-sourced products, but also impact on their commercial products. Satish said this would be too much to commission. WG would have to figure out how to proceed with filling up the UA gap. Satish opened the floor on this matter.

Suggestion in chat:

Jim: Or we can publish the patch, and encourage some other group to fork Dovecot.

Benjamin: I was just wondering if the project can be floated as an open-source project.

Seda edited the task description on Dovecot Remediation as follow:

[Contribute improvements to Dovecot code to correct EAI support problems.](#)

[Patching up Dovecot and other IMAP Servers to support UTF8.](#)

And the timeline was added as “2024 - asap”

New Ref 6: This item is from the survey and similar to the New Ref 8, which was separated into two parts. The description for New Ref 6 was left empty.

New Ref 8.1: “Develop best practices.” This is for 2024.

New Ref 8.2: “Developing and maintaining international standards.” This is for 2025-2026.

New Ref 13: The task was updated as “Commission minimal but functioning code fragments.” This is for 2025-2029.

New Ref 14: The task was updated as “Focus on Open-Source email service software: Assess the pieces of software to see if they are interoperable” Jim

added that this would be for softwares which are part of the email ecosystem, but separate from Dovecot. This is for 2026-2029.

Jim suggested that looking for free software components with less UA ready level of EAI support, and remediating all those to at least the Gold-level would be a big multi-step project. Satish said there would be multiple deliverables. Jim explained that there is a similar work item of the EAI WG on email hosting software. When the vendor identifies the non-configurable components, we would know what components need UA remediation. Satish said the action item can be listed although there is possible overlap with EAI WG's work. Jim said the reason for objection from some organizations is that some software could be broken because of UA remediation. Jim suggested providing a set of software that does the UA job would clear the obstacles.

Satish said the level of support for different pieces of softwares that would be interoperable as the whole end to end delivery of emails. This would be interesting to have. There was no objection to this work item.

UA Curriculum: The syllabus is formally under the Measurement WG.

New Ref 17: Under the Education category, Jim suggested adding <Write a paper on how to validate an email address> which was previously discussed. Satish agreed. He volunteered to do this work initially to be shared with WG. Benjamin Akinmoyeje and Letsatsi Lekhooa would help as well.

1. Understand why you are validating
2. The best way to validate is by sending message to user and let user send back a confirmation receipt
3. Simple minded regular expression and reject valid email addresses.
4. HTML5 specification is broken

Satish agreed with Jim's suggestion on not rejecting the internationalized email addresses. This would be a good sense of incremental process. This is for 2024-2025.

Jim also pointed out that UASG has poor connection to the world of Academia for publishing papers in academic journals. Normally the studies would be published on the UASG website and let people find out. Benjamin agreed. Satish added that domain name validation would be part of this as well.

There was no objection to this 5-year plan of Tech WG.

This planning document would be shared with the Coordination WG and also shared at the ICANN79 to receive community feedback.

Agenda#3: Report of Survey Results

Seda presented the [survey results report](#) which has captured all the responses from the participants. Seda asked if we need a summary report with the response sheet in the appendix. Satish said the raw data would still be useful but asked if there is any data to be kept confidential. Seda said the owner of the survey data would be ICANN and any personal details would not be shared. Satish said a high-level summary report would be alright.

Seda shared the top three answers of the first question, **and Satish said the top three from each question would be sufficient**. Jim said the purpose is to answer the original purpose of the survey and highlighted the three points:

1. Identify the big picture of UA challenges and issue recommendations to the UASG. For example: what are the common threats?
2. Some of the questions are related and the answers are correlated. The answers of each participant are correlated, however, the result may not reflect the link of answers among the questions. Therefore, looking into the original responses would be useful.
3. Cover all the methodology details. What report tool should be made and the facts to be written in the report.

Satish agreed with Jim. As for now, the details would be too much, and WG could start at the big picture first. The details could be useful, however, the focus would be the summary.

Satish reviewed the survey results, and checked the top results. Jim said this is a good first step of a summary. He may need time to check the responses details to judge the summary’s concreteness. To have more confidence in the report, please allow some time to compare the results and the summary. Satish agreed to allow some reasonable time. Satish also would like to see more of the bigger picture. Satish asked Seda for suggestions.

Seda would be able to share the raw data after confirming with the Legal team, however, for the content analysis, it may take some time until after the ICANN79. Jim volunteered to do some analysis and share with the WG. Satish agreed. The excel sheet for the raw data, excluding personal information, could be added in appendix. Jim liked the summary approach and he requested some time offline on working on to see if the summary reflects the majority of the responses.

Jim said he would like to think about the time frame. Jim suggested stating the survey methodologies, the target participants and number of respondents, without adding too much of the summary, just sharing the stage of the first phase that the survey results were collected and results are being analyzed.

Satish said informing the community about the stage is a good idea, and a more detailed report could take time. Jim said there could be a risk if we share the summary too soon, which would mislead the observers only to the top answers. Satish suggested continuing this discussion in the next meeting.

Meeting was concluded.

Next Meeting: 1 April 2024, Monday 15:00 UTC

Action Items:

No	Action Item	Owner
----	-------------	-------



Universal Acceptance

1	Communicate with team for the next meeting date and time	Seda
2	Review the report of the survey	WG
3	Share the 5-year plan spreadsheet to Coordination WG and also at ICANN79 for community feedback	Seda
4	Review the Survey Summary	WG, Jim
5	Share the raw data of survey results without personal identification information	Seda

Reference:

Jim sent comments about next steps in email with the subject "[UA-Tech] Survey on Universal Acceptance Strategy - next steps?" from Jim DeLaHunt <list+uasg@jdlh.com> to UA-tech mailing list <ua-tech@icann.org> on Mon Jan 22 09:01:13 UTC 2024.

- Comments are on list archive at <<https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/ua-tech/2024-January/000765.html>>.