UA Technology WG Meeting
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Attendees
Abdalmonem Galila
Abdel Gaffar Ouro-Agoro
Dennis Tan Tanaka
Dessalegn Yehuala
Marc Blanchet
Sarmad Hussain
Sonigitu Ekpe
Zied Bouziri

Agenda
1. A Recap of UA Sessions from ICANN 66 meeting
2. The UASG004 Document Review
3. Fixing UA readiness issues in Programming libraries
   - Using existing knowledge base- UASG018, https://uasg.tech/software/ [uasg.tech]
   - Priority issues:
     ✓ PHP’s lack of support for Unicode and IDNA
     ✓ Server Side Scripting Vs Client Side Scripting ?
     ✓ Open Source Software Development Frameworks
4. Structuring UA readiness efforts with respect to commonly agreed (high-level) deployment architecture of platforms (including CMSs) of priority of interest:
   - Presentation layer services (front end)
   - Business layer services (middle tier)
   - Data services (back ends- DBMSs)
5. Bootstrapping the subgroups
6. AOB

Meeting Notes

ICANN66 Meeting Recap

A brief account of UA sessions at ICANN66 was provided to the members. It was shared that ALAC and GAC announced UA focused working groups. Members appreciated and supported the new UA session strategy of ICANN. It was suggested if a half-day during ICANN could be organized. The members were informed that this would be tough due to scheduling challenges, but if clear objectives are shared, the suggestions can be discussed with UASG leadership.
**UASG 004 Update**

The working group members were informed that the document contains domain and email classes with examples. It was shared if these cases still remain relevant, considering these were developed in 2016. For example, just using a single example of newshort like “link”, etc. may not be representative. So either the results should be qualified or use multiple examples.

It was also raised that TLDs are a dynamic set of strings so testing should also capture the fact that this is also managed by the applications. Those with static list of TLDs will not work. The community was asked to contribute back on any additional cases. It was also raised that though variety will be more representative, it also increases the testing effort for the studies being undertaken.

**Fixing UA readiness issues in Programming libraries and priorities**

It was noted that the programming languages need to be reviewed for their support for UA readiness. PHP is a legacy programming language but is still extensively used. A strategy is needed to reconcile these competing issues, especially due its use in CMSs. For CMSs an alternate option would be to create libraries for CMSs which by-pass PHP limitations. It was also raised that operating systems should also be considered for UA readiness discussions, though it may be a very complicated problem to solve and may not deliver the desired UA readiness. Also, the analysis done already is not fed back into review of the programming languages. So there is also a communication problem in addition to the technology issue. Prioritizing the programming languages to assess their UA readiness also needs to be done, which should be based on a survey. This should be done in collaboration with the Measurement WG.

**Subgroups**

All were reminded that there are three subgroups on UA readiness, remediation and training. The discussion would continue on the email list.

**Action items**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Suggest any changes to UASG004</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>