

## **Other Name and Address Standard Initiatives**

A number of name and address XML standards efforts are underway throughout the world. To a large extent, these standards have been designed with a particular business requirement in mind, for example, the expedient delivery of a piece of mail. This has generally meant that while the particular standard is appropriate for the purpose for which it was designed, it is frequently not suitable for a variety of other purposes. **This is the key differentiator between xNAL and the other name and address initiatives throughout world.**

### **How does xNAL differ from the other standardisation efforts**

xNAL is the only Name and Address XML Standard in industry to-date that is open, vendor neutral, application independent (i.e. independent of postal services, CRM, name and address parsing, matching and validation, etc.) and importantly, global (designed to handle names and addresses of any country in a detailed level [detailed elementisation of name and address data] or in an abstract level).

Most of the other standards are based around the postal and address database businesses (e.g. mail delivery). But, it is important to note that name and address data are the most commonly used entities by businesses for many different purposes (e.g. CRM, address validation, marketing, data quality, data validation, customer profiling, census, segmentation, personal information, etc.). Sticking in specific postal rules and postal specific elements in name and address standards for mail delivery purposes could be overkill to other non-postal businesses. The ideal solution to build a name and address standard for businesses like postal services is to take an application independent name and address standard like xNAL and then extend it. We are in the 21<sup>st</sup> century and surprisingly, less than 40 countries of the 240+ countries have formal postal strategies (postal rules) that have been implemented and are followed. Only a handful of developed Western/European countries in the world have a Postal/National Address Reference File to perform address validation and verification. It is therefore, a long haul and a long hard journey to go through before postal authorities of countries around the world would agree and start to use a single global name and address standard designed for postal services.

The CIQ TC therefore, made sure that the standards that it develops could cope with any type of name and address that needs an abstract level or detailed level of representation of name and address data. It took more than two years of serious hard work from the CIQ TC to develop xNAL involving experts with many years of expertise in the following:

- International (Global) Address Database Management Services
- Use and management of International Name and Address data in small to large complex enterprise applications and systems (e.g. CRM, DW/DM, e-business, Customer Information Systems, etc)
- International Name and Address Data Integrity and Quality Management
- International Name and Address Parsing, Matching, Validation and Verification
- International Name and Address Data Management Tools
- Postal Address Certification

The above skills and expertise led to the successful development of xNAL and ensured that it is open, application independent, vendor neutral, and truly global (international). xNAL also provides options to represent postal service elements. It also provides options to use external namespace references in its schema structure.

Following are the other initiatives in progress to develop a name and address standard:

<b>Project Team</b>	<b>Consortium/ Organisation</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>ASC/X12 Transaction Set 101 for Domestic Name and Address List</b>	United States Postal Services, Industry leaders and DISA	Specific to postal service business. Domestic (USA) name and address for transmission of strung address lines or parsed address elements. No XML involved. USA specific.
<b>UN/PROLST</b>	UN/EDIFACT for international name and address lists based on Transaction Set 101	Specific to postal service business. Specifically designed for Mail delivery and uses code tables and templates Working closely with UPU on address templates Some XML work underway. More USA specific.
<b>British Standard 7666</b>	BSI IST/36	XML schema developed. Specific to names and addresses of U.K
<b>CEN TC 331/WG3</b>	European Standardisation Body and Universal Postal Union (UPU)	Specific to postal service business. Specifically designed for Mail delivery and postal services. No schemas available yet. Still at a requirements/specifications stage. Aimed at international name and address. A long way to go.
<b>ECCMA International Address Element Code</b>	Electronic Commerce Code Management Association	Specific to postal service business. Developed the International Address Element Code (IAEC) that is a schema that identifies the component data elements of a name and address. This is to improve the distribution of name and address information and the formatting of international addresses for mailing and postal services purpose. Address templates are developed to specify the order in which name and address information will be displayed line by line in an envelope/letter. Though aimed as international standard, only very few developed countries are involved in this project. A long way to go. IAEC is very USA centric when you look into the table. Nothing to do with XML.
<b>GCA Address Data Interchange Specification (ADIS)</b>	GCA/IDEAlliance	Specific to postal service business. An industry name and address standard for domestic (USA) and International Address Management and Mail production using Address elements. Compatible with USA EDI TS-101 standard. Supports PROLST. This standard also transmits printer-oriented information for printing addresses on envelopes.
<b>HR-XML</b>	HR-XML Consortium	Does not concentrate on name and address standards, but has developed its own name and address standard as part of its specifications. Claims to do international addressing, but uses simple address lines to tag complex international addresses. Therefore, the standard does not help to interpret international addresses and hence, cannot be used effectively in applications (Example: Parsing, matching, validation, verification, etc) where detailed elementisation of name and address data is important. Lack of understanding of the complexity of international names and addresses. For example, uses elements like Given Name and Family Name (without even an option to define what type of name it is) that has no meaning for many non-western/non European Countries, as there is no such

## **Name and Address Initiatives: A document from the OASIS CIQ TC**

---

<b>Project Team</b>	<b>Consortium/ Organisation</b>	<b>Comments</b>
		concept.
<b>UK GovTalk Address</b>	UK Government	XML schemas that extends on BS 7666 Standards for addresses and specific to UK addresses only.
<b>Universal Postal Union (UPU)</b>	Universal Postal Union (UPU)	Specific to postal service business. Aligned with the USPS, UN/PROLST and works with these groups closely.
<b>Address Data Content Standard</b>	US Federal Geographic Data Committee	Aims at building a standard for sharing address information. Applicable to addresses having a spatial component and primarily for geographic data. No XML standards development.
<b>Australian Standard for Exchange of Client Information AS-4590</b>	Standards Australia	No XML standard development. But a general standard has been developed for managing Australian names and addresses and other client information.
<b>FINAL DRAFT AUSTRALIAN/NEW ZEALAND STANDARD: Geographic Information -Rural and Urban Addressing</b>	Standards Australia Standards New Zealand	No XML standards implementation. But a general standard for geographical addressing for the Australian and New Zealand countries.
<b>HL7</b>	HL7 Consortium	Does not concentrate on name and address standards. But has developed a simple name and address XML standard as part of its overall efforts. Claims to have developed an international name and address standard as part of health care standard. But uses simple address lines to tag complex international addresses. Therefore, the standard does not help to interpret international name and addresses and hence, cannot be used effectively in applications where names and addresses are important. Lack of understanding of the complexity of international names and addresses.

For more details about some of the above standards, go to:

<http://xml.coverpages.org/namesAndAddresses.html>