



# AFAV Working Group Weekly Meeting

Feb. 12, 2015



# Agenda

---

- Recap of last meeting;
- Continue discussion on the work-list:
  - The level should be validated for different countries and territories;
  - Data format for validation;

# Recap of Last Meeting

---

- The WG had a consensus on the high-level principles.
- The WG had a consensus on the adjusted working agenda.
- The WG had a consensus that we can utilize Doodle Poll for voting mechanism.
- Volunteer identified for previous industry experience researching.
- The WG direct staff to draft up a question set in researching previous experiences.
- The WG has preliminary agreed that all countries and territories' addresses need to be validate to avoid "Venue shopping". It was also as reminded by staff that since not all countries and territories have the same detailed address system, level of validation may be different for different places, but should down to the level possible.
- The WG asked staff about previous research on possible providers, and recommended staff to do more research on available data.

# Countries & Territories need to be validated

Validate to State/Province level	List of Countries Territories	<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>
Validate to city/county or district level	List of Countries Territories	<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>
All fields need to validate	List of Countries Territories	<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>
	All C&Ts	UPU S42 compliant C&Ts	Others Categorization (by Region?)



# Proposed Text for Working Item #1

---

- Addresses for all countries or territories should be validated to the level possible subject to the data availability of the commercially and technically feasible provider.

## Note:

- Commercial and technical feasibility will be defined in later working items in the working list.
- WG members are encouraged to propose providers as well.

# Proposed Question Set for Previous Industry Experience Research

---

- What's the entity's current requirements on address validation and/or verification?
- What's the entity's current validation and/or verification mechanism?
- Who's the address validation and/or verification provider, or database provider?
- The accuracy of the validation and/or verification, and the error feedback method?
- Lessons learnt.

# Data Format for Validation

---

- ASCII
- Non-ASCII
  - What kind of writing systems are currently supported by registrars;
  - Transliterated or translated address data.

Thank You!

