# UA EAI WG Meeting
## 18th Oct 2022

**Attendees**
Mark Svancarek
Jim DeLaHunt
Harsha Wijayawardhana
Akshat - ThinkTrans
Abdalmonem Galila
Hafiz Annour
Nitin Walia
Mohammed Awal Alhassan
Amina Ramallan
Jessica Dadzie
Seda Akbulut


**Agenda**
1. Welcome and roll call
2. Update on the Project "EAI Technical education and Awareness to the developers' community via Q&A websites"
3. AOB

**Meeting recording:**
https://icann.zoom.us/rec/share/WshjCzEbDVhPlU0TgJpoy3P8Z0kkgYssFMGLLaG KY95uv9VvZlojIE5BF_T5icZ-.X9QDUxGbjtFZ4aAm

**Meeting Notes**
Seda invited Akshat Joshi from ThinkTrans to present the report on the Developer Forums Project and the new FAQ document. Both reports were shared with the EAI WG: https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/ua-eai/2022-October/001654.html

Akshat started to present the report on the engagement on the developer forums

There are six particular forums defined on the relevant SOW:
1. Stackoverflow: most prominent Q&A forum. EAI WG needs to focus on.
2. Serverfafault: Similart to stackoverflow. It focuses on servers. Another prominent forum.

3. Github: Also an important platform. In addition to the "Issues" feature on Github, a new feature was released, "discussion feature".
4. Hashnode: Not a Q&A forum. Communication is over blogs.
5. *Developer circles by facebook:* Not an online Q&A platform. It allows to engage with developers at physical events. Not a vibrant online forum. Not considered as part of the online engagement work.
6. *Freecodecamp:* Exciting for initial coding learners. However, because of that the questions are very basic, and discourse is not very rich. Not considered as part of this work.

To have more meaningful engagement on UA, #5 and #6 are replaced with CodeProject and Reddit. This change was approved by the EAI WG chairs.
Akshat shared the difficulties on sharing the answers on codeproject where his responses were blocked for some reasons mentioned in the report in detail. (e.g. responding to old questions, for driving to uasg.tech website, bounty hunting). Those can be found in the appendix A.

Additionally, two articles have been posted on Hashnode, which requires the community's upvote to increase the visibility.

Akshat also presented the FAQ document in which he also suggested answers to those questions that are mostly asked in the developer forums.

Regarding the answers submitted on the developer forums, all reports are open to entire UASG community for their input. **Community is called for action to star/upvote the answers to increase the visibility.**

**Call for action: upvote, if you agree. If you don't agree, share your input through ua-eai [at] icann.org address.**

Mark Sv asked what bounty hunting is and why it is a bad thing.
Akshat responded that the more questions you respond the more your reputation is inflated and picking old questions makes it awaken. So every time you answer a question they give you a sort of point that gets added to your profile. Even signing in has one participation point, then posting to a general forum has a particular point. We had analysis of the program done, we had a set of ten questions to be answered. It didn't matter how old the question was. So, he answered all possible meaningful relevant questions. Some people were kind of objecting to it, saying that why are you waking up the old questions. The one who is posting the question is not even looking for answers anymore.

Mark Sv asked who owns the universal acceptance FAQ? And what would it take to add these proposed FAQ additions to it?

Seda responded that Comms WG initiated that work. But Sarmad and herself also take care of them. The intention is to review them to see if they are still valid, and put all FAQ documents into a clickable format in HTML in addition to the PDF format. Mark and Jim agreed.

Jim proposed a suggestion about the FAQ. If we haven't already put them in the FAQ as simple questions with simple answers, we're missing a chance to educate by not having that. Each question should have its own URL or bookmark to find it and share it. (UASG.tech/FAQ and a # and a label within the page) Our website is not very good at this. Unfortunately, we're not very good at having concise URLs to our information, and that's why so much good information is buried on that website.

### Feedback to Akshat about the reports:

- Jim: For the FAQ draft answers, suggested making them even stronger. Add links to the specific authoritative documentation that justifies the answer, and not just to the top of the document, but to a section within the document. Jim gave two examples to Akshat from his draft, suggested adding a link to the authoritative resource to justify each answer.

- Jim: Question 2: "Typically" is a weak word there. Use a stronger word. Link it to the exact RFC with the section in that RFC.
  Akshat responded to the feedback about the Q2, and said that problem with question two is that there is a lot of confusion around it. This is regarding the RFC and mother RFC. Therefore he did not include the RFC intentionally. One of them was written by J. Klensin. Jim recommended putting it in a way that our ecosystem is not consistent. Therefore, you cannot rely on what one RFC reflects. We exist in an ecosystem, of incompatibility and inconsistency, and where reality is incompatible and inconsistent, rather than pretend that there's a real answer.

- Question 3: Referring to 1035 is good but also have the URL point to the direct section in the RFC.

- Mark Sv: We have documents that answer some of these questions in the FAQ. For these questions in the FAQ, we should point out the relevant UASG documents and resources by giving links. Then it is more helpful.
- Mark Sv: If you're writing something that's going to accept email addresses, you should use this expansive definition on 64 to 54. We need to find a way how we deal with engaging with the administrators on these platforms. Is there any way to engage the moderators to introduce ourselves as UASG or ICANN? It sounds like they just show up, say no, and go away. But is there anything better than that?
  Akshat mentioned that most of these moderators are basically users who have been promoted to be moderators because of their way of engaging with the users. They won't directly be able to mold the behavior of the platform. He asked the platform owners to change the engagement methods for example including authoritative resources, and create a high visibility function would be useful. He suggested interacting not directly through moderator, but through the platform owner. But if we really want to ask the platform owners to change certain functionality, we could talk to some of the prominent ones, stackoverflow, and ask them to probably include definitive authority like UASG, that would be definitely useful.

- Nitin: FAQ – Q2 about the maximum length of the response which has been written actually is very generic. On Google Search engine, search results give that RFC says 254. These messages don't fit into the email system. Hence the length was decided as 254. So ultimately the response, you know, to these FAQs has to be linked with those RFCs, and has to be given in a more detailed way.

- Jim: Page Regarding the table on 10-11 of the developer forum, Jim asked that part in a text file as well, so that it's easier for him to make his own list of the question titles and the URLs. It is not convenient to copy from the word file.

- Jim: "How many of them have gotten up votes? Because that's useful for us in evaluating how effective the exercise has been. For instance, I looked at the first two you posted one had been removed by an administrator or delayed by the administrator. And I can kind of see the reason why the

second one hasn't gotten any up votes yet. It's a fine answer, but it hasn't gotten any up votes yet."

Akshat mentioned that he would definitely share the document.

- Nitin referred to the keywords: IDN-Domain-Validation-Email-idna-Unicode. When you say IDN, how does it relate to EAI? These are very generic keywords. Akshat mentioned that these are only used for capturing the initial questions, then he did a wider search. They were a lot wider than these only six terms.

**Other inputs on the chat:**

Jim DeLaHunt, Vancouver, Canada to Everyone (18:31)
For StackOverflow in particular, the way to engage the administrators is the "Meta Site": https://meta.stackoverflow.com/. e.g. "Popular question from 2009 with obsolete answer"
https://meta.stackoverflow.com/questions/309335/popular-question-from-2009-with-obsolete-answer ;
 Or, "Introduce an "Obsolete Answer" vote"
https://meta.stackoverflow.com/questions/272651/introduce-an-obsolete-answer-vote ;

Jim DeLaHunt, Vancouver, Canada to Everyone (18:36)
This story about "max length of email address" has so many details, twists, and turns, I think it would be a fascinating technical blog post.

Nitin Walia to Everyone (18:37)
That limit is a maximum of 64 characters (octets) in the "local part" (before the "@") and a maximum of 255 characters (octets) in the domain part (after the "@") for a total length of 320 characters. However, there is a restriction in RFC 2821 on the length of an address in MAIL and RCPT commands of 254 characters. Since addresses that do not fit in those fields are not normally useful, the upper limit on address lengths should normally be considered to be 254.

Jim DeLaHunt, Vancouver, Canada to Everyone (18:38)
Good point. We should maybe evaluate the way in which the email address limit might restrict the domain names one chooses.

Seda mentioned that inputs will be incorporated but if the group has more input we can wait one more week or two  for further review on the reports. Also highlighted that there is the call for action for the UASG community to upvote.

**Next Meeting:** Tuesday 25<sup>th</sup> Oct 2022 at 14:30 UTC

## Action items

| No. | Action Item | Owner |
|-----|-------------|-------|
| 1 | Call for action for the UASG community to review and upvote the questions if you agree, otherwise share your input on the mailing list. | All |