UA EAI WG Meeting
06 September 2022

Attendees

Mark Svancarek
Carine L. Malor
Jim DeLaHunt
Harsha Wijayawardhana
Seda Akbulut

Agenda

Meeting Agenda:

1. Welcome and roll call

2. [Statement of Work (SOW)](#) for E1.1 and E1.2
   a) Building a self-certification tool to generate EAI readiness score.
   b) Helping early EAI providers perform self-certification using the guide.

3. Next steps with the EAI [self-certification guide](#)
   a) User acceptance tests and input by the community on the draft guide.
   b) A quick guide for IT and procurement managers.
4. AOB

Meeting Recording:
https://icann.zoom.us/rec/share/LIwjU9I7JrszdcztamimZMfqpS1GucnyejVSAqZrF
aMjfwRT1HpOvBJCjSKS-kpD.Qo-AXMwl_CCNbwvB

Meeting Notes

Mark welcomed everyone and went through the points in description of work that are still under debate. Mark went through all the points. He said that we should focus on the project plan and move towards deliverables.

Mark went through the project plan. He said that right now the EAI self-certification guide is not prescriptive enough to generate these scores and

explained his point. He said that we need to provide more information to the vendor. The first point written in the project plan can be achieved.

Mark added a note "this algorithm must be developed by UASG". Another option would be to ask the vendor to do the work and then we sign off. But then the vendor might give the lowest score amongst all other scores, where it should not be the case.

Harsha asked whether we are going to automate it or not. Mark said that in his opinion if it has a proper algorithm, it can be automated. Harsha asked will the system at the end provide us with a score. Mark answered the question, and they further discussed the point. Harsha asked if it's going to be a manual score. Mark said that our web app was not going to be able to test somebody else's services directly and gave an example to clarify the point about MUA, where there are 38 line items. One would submit 38 results (pass or fail).

Mark said that this SOW is just for generating scores and we are not saying that there is one toolkit for running the test. He said that there is a sample code in the GitHub repository. Harsha said that we may have to develop it separately. Mark said that the vendor is not providing a single toolkit that everybody uses, and it will not be launched from the website.

Harsha suggested that if each region or country may have to test their own EAI, then you have the test in the GitHub so that you can modify it and have your own script. And once you finish it's like any other open source based thing. Mark said that it can be a possibility and gave an example of Microsoft. Harsha said that other software developers can use this thing and develop their own script or alter it. Mark agreed and said that it can be an ideal open-source environment.

Mark said that this is different from SOW. Harsha agreed and said that we can bring in such a vendor who can build the platform in such a manner that it can be a template kind of thing. And if we give the templates the others can benefit from this. Mark requested some clarification. Harsha explained his point. Mark said that it is an interesting idea but it's out of the scope for this SOW. Mark said that this SOW has nothing to do with tests and further explained his point.

Harsha said that if this is a manual thing, he doesn't know how far it will work. Mark responded and said that it would be good if you could just submit your codes or provide URLs and run the whole thing smoothly but at the same time it's difficult and beyond the scope of this SOW. Mark said that if you have a

collection of test results we will be able to tell what the score is. He said that if it's just MUA, then it's pretty simple. Mark said that if you have multiple components in a system then you have more complicated algorithms and asked if this is the actual scope of the work that we are planning to do. Mark asked whether everyone agrees with it.

Jim said that we have got two levels of reactions on this document. One is the things that we can fix by rewording the document. He said that we could rewrite SOW to make things clear. He shared that in last meeting we discussed that are we ready to issue this contract and there are several high level objections to having a vendor doing this project

Jim summarized the earlier meeting's notes, and shared that our discussion last time ended up with 2 kinds of objections. **1. unclear points in the SOW which can be fixed by changing wording of SOW. 2. aspects which argue that we are not ready to contract out this work yet.** So it is up to us to provide the algorithm to do the scoring. He said that it is going to be a difficult algorithm to write. He said that there is another objection regarding the validation of the tool. And then there is the issue of the amount of money available to provide such service to the providers.

Jim said that we are ready to identify a couple of providers and customers to ask them to perform the test manually. We should focus on getting the first few providers through the process without the tool and then we will know what that tool should do. He said that we have to work on the objections before we move to the SOW itself. Jim further explained his point. He said that the list of tests is in the Self-certification guide document. Harsha asked Jim a question and said the vendor develops their tests like modules that can be plug-in. Jim answered and said some can and some tests are worded so it requires a human to operate the tool and gave an example.

Followings are suggested to reword the document:
1) The job of the vendor is…. Are we ready to issue this contract? We are not ready to have a vendor to do this work yet. Reason is we need to provide the algorithm.
2) How is the tool hosted? How is it done persistent after the contract is ended.
3) Will it fit in the budget?

4) This is too early to ask providers to do it without the tool. So we should stop working on SOW and continue with the other preparations aforementioned.

Jim suggested hearing Nitin's argument as an important contrast to Jim's in our 9 August meeting.

An email developer reads the guide. Take the sample code. They run sample tests. Go to a web app. Web app test says pass or fail. They type the results. Harsha asked whether the code is in Github. Jim said that the list is in the self-certification guide.

Mark described his understanding of Jim and Harsha's discussion. Mark said that the idea of "test harness" is great but we are trying to do something simple. Harsha asked whether it is a plug-in? " But this is not the scope of the EAI WG.

Jim said that we are ready to **try a couple of reference providers and reference customers and then ask them to do the self-certification guide themselves manually and to tell the results** and continue with the whole scheme of things that can be done.

Jim said that we can move on and discuss the reference email providers and reference customers. Jim said that we need to have the reference providers and they should try and take the Self-certification guide and perform those tests and tell us in what ways it still has flaws. Jim said that in this way we will be able to fix the guide. Jim pointed out the E3.1 and E3.2. Jim gave an overview of E3.1 and E3.2. He said that E3.2 can be done in parallel with the provider working on Self-certification guide. Jim asked what is the nature of support that vendor provides to an email system provider who is trying to run the tests and if we can afford to pay the vendor.

Mark went through the description of work point two and said that this is creating a confusion of whether there is a test harness or not. Mark said let's suppose there is no test harness than what will be the support provided by the vendor. Mark said that the vendor can easily explain the algorithm and gave some other examples. Mark said that UASG needs to support the algorithm. Jim said that we have to do the work of the algorithm by ourselves. Mark said that the 38 tests in MUA are pretty straight forward.

Mark asked that what **if I have a golden MUA and a silver MTA, and the user experience is good, so is the overall score gold or silver? And to remove this complexity we need to develop an algorithm.** Mark shared that if you are working on a single component then this is very straight forward. Jim further discussed the importance of having an algorithm.

Mark went through E1.1. Seda suggested that we can merge a few items like while UASG is working on algorithms we can invite one EAI provider to our meetings so that they can work on Self-certification guide and we can start working on algorithms and certify them. Mark said that Jim's point E3.2 has to happen first and explained the point. He said that we can have them work on E1.1. And in the course of E1.2 we understand what we want in E1.1. Jim agreed with Mark.

Seda said that there are some local initiatives and we are renewing their contracts. And we are thinking about asking them to do the test based on the EAI Self-certification guide. Seda asked if it's ok to include this thing in the initiative. Mark agreed and said that it's very important and said that anyone who can provide the resources for this thing can be very important to us. Harsha said that he will try to get some volunteers also.

Jim suggested we need a flow chart in order to clarify this thing. **Mark said that he will work on the flowchart about better executing the action plan, and then everyone can review it.** He will share the first draft. And we will continue on it together.

Harsha said that we need to run these tests to find out how well these platforms are. Jim communicated some points regarding local initiatives using self-certification guides and coming up with test results and said that it might be a good way of getting traction. **Jim said that one contribution to the community-built test harness can be software engineering classes, through incentivizing.** Harsha said that it can be a good project and we can even publish the results. **Mark said that he will try and ask his India team to locate some students and do something similar.** Harsha said that we can also test it in Sri Lanka.

Jim said that anybody who is writing code to test email components will have a test they feed in. If that test data is abstracted into an input data file, then somebody else could come in and add more test cases. Harsha agreed with Jim. Jim said that this will lead to people taking EAI seriously.

Mark thanked everyone for their time.

Next Meeting: Tuesday 18 October 2022 UTC 1430 -1530

Action items

No.	Action Item	Owner
1	Draft a flowchart of the action items from the FY23 Action Plan	Mark
2	Contribute to finalizing the workflow Mark drafts	EAI WG
3	Local Initiatives may wish to test the EAI readiness using the self-certification guide and share their feedback	Local Initiatives
4	Ask India team to locate students to experience the EAI self-certification guide	Mark