

# AFAV Working Group Weekly Meeting

Feb. 27, 2015



# Agenda

---

- Roll Call;
- 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

---

- It was asked by WG member and was confirmed by staff that the language used in RAA for Whois Address Across Field Validation is subject to ICANN's pending review of the Whois Accuracy Program Specification with the Registrar Stakeholder Group. In the meantime, the current work for AFAV should still follow the track as previously planned.
- The WG had a robust discussion around the idea of consistency vs. specificity of address validation (i.e., whether all addresses should be validated to the same level. (e.g., for all countries, the city and province must pass the validation) or different levels (e.g., if house-number data is available in some countries, registrars must validate to that level, but to a lesser level if less specific data is available in other countries)). Most WG members seemed to agree that validation to the same level, regardless of country, would be operationally easier and could help prevent “venue shopping” by bad actor-registrants.
- A question was raised about how this approach might be perceived by community members, and it was suggested by staff that registrars and members of law enforcement consider whether compromise can be reached as part of ICANN's review of the Whois Accuracy Program Specification.
- It was explained by staff that concerns like false positive handling, technically and commercially feasibility would be addressed by the WG later down the road.
- Some WG members had raised concerns of degrees of accuracy, but it was suggested by staff 100% accuracy may not be needed for AFAV, a “degree of confidence” might be more appropriate, and this is something that the WG could help establish.

# Proposed Text for Working Item #1

---

- Addresses for all countries and territories should be validated at a consistent confidence level or score level which is commercially and technically feasible.

## Note:

- the confidence level, reporting format and false positive handling will be decided later in the work.
- WG members are encouraged to propose providers as well.

# Data Format for Validation

---

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

Thank You!

