

# UA Technology WG Meeting

## 13 April 2020

### Attendees

1. Aman Masjadi
2. Dennis Tan Tanaka
3. Dessalegn Yehuala
4. Jay Paudyal
5. Jim DeLaHunt
6. Mark Datysgeld
7. Satish Babu
8. Satish Kadim
9. Sushanta Sinha
10. T. Santhosh
11. Zied Bouziri
12. Sarmad Hussain

### Agenda

1. Review of [FY20 Action Plan](#) for UA Tech WG (Section 4.1.1.)
2. UA Tech WG Planning for FY21
  - a. Complete tasks remaining from FY20?
  - b. Add additional tasks not listed in FY20?
3. Review of [SOW on Content Management Systems](#) shared by UA Measurement WG
4. Continue to develop [SOW for standards and best practices](#)
5. AOB

### Meeting Notes

The members continued to review the progress of tech WG on FY20 action plan.

T10. It was discussed on whether “bug bounty” is a viable option. It was noted that such programs are run by the owners of the code and limited to discovering new bugs. In that sense, “bug bounty” may not be directly applicable. Even where such cases are possible in open source projects, this can be explored. This may be harder to estimate and also the contracting should be done with a specific entity. Related questions include how such work will be estimated, and how such work will be tested (who will test it and when do we consider the work as complete; when integrated or earlier?). A “bug bounty” also develops the reputation of the organization within the open source community.

T11. Hackathons are ongoing but multiple instances are being done by UA Ambassadors and will also be done by local initiatives. There is now associated training on Java and email deployment, which will contribute to this effort.

Licensing of the code and repository for the code was discussed. It was suggested that these should be put in a UASG repository with a specified license. It was noted that this work is done by students and

so the code may not be industrial strength. It could still be useful if it is labelled well. It may be useful to tag it appropriately for reference. However, this is mainly done for capacity development and due to that it may not need further coordination. This needs to be discussed further.

T12. This item relates to taking the output of the WG to various local and regional conferences and magazines. This should be ongoing activity but may have some impact due to the pandemic.

T13. Training materials have been developed and are being rolled out. Work on Java has been done as a start. Additional materials for other programming languages will also need to be developed. It was raised that these should be converted to online videos. A tutorial on UA is being planned at Unicode technical conference in October.

T14. This is a generic item, covered through discussions on the list.

T15. Tech WG continues to support comms WG on communications.

T16. This item will be carried out after remediation work starts

As next steps, it should also be considered if any additional work needs to be added for FY21 action plan.

### **SOW on CMS**

The members were presented an overview of the SOW on CMS. They were told that the output of the work will be forwarded to the tech WG for further training and remediation. The current SOW focuses on hosted version of Wordpress (wordpress.org). Once this work is completed, the broader study can be conducted including other CMS tools and services. This SOW will use UASG026 testing framework.

### **Action items**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Action Item</b>	<b>Owner</b>
1	Explore the use of “bug bounty” and other strategies for remediating software	SH
2	Discuss between WGs to decide on whether to coordinate the code being produced by Hackathons	SH
3	Review <a href="#">SOW on CMS</a> by 30 April	All