

## Agenda for UG5 10/8/14:

### Housekeeping

- EPF Reminder
  - Around 97% of companies have signed up.
  - No CDs/DVDs sent out this week, if there are any issues we'll get it soon
  - Chris: The headers for the downloads are formatted for DOS, not UNIX? The formats are outlined in the developers guide, will need to investigate.
  - Shawn: would be nice to get a zip file rather than a tar file. Will need to find out why that decision was made.

### Topics:

- AEC I/II (Issue 120)
  - Onboarding non-CAPS mailers
    - Manual process requires mailers to fill out a form with each process. USPS cannot store credit card information outside CAPS. This is to comply with PCI.
    - Kim: Could a customer use a permit instead? Perhaps with the universal permit project? AEC isn't linked into the permit system which is primarily for postage.
  - Additional footnote codes/documentation
    - Researching the effort to return all the "how" codes and the risk.
    - Adam: finding some definitely wrong results from AEC I. Can we come up with an estimate of the AEC accuracy? We'd have to look into this. AEC hasn't changed much since it was instated in the 90's. The code has been mostly static. Adam to send in example addresses. The addresses in question have code BX and the ZIP code changed, but not all BX coded addresses have issues.
  - Promotions
    - How can we promote AEC? This has been submitted through USPS channels. We don't anticipate much pushback on this, but USPS employees aren't able to waive fees.
    - Perhaps this could be brought up in UG8?
    - Angelo: could productize the AEC historical data and bundle with NCOA? Exposing the historical file might dry up the need for AEC II. The ideal placement would be to do AEC processing between CASS and NCOA. More NCOA moves would likely result.
    - Chuck: How big is the historical file? 2-3 million addresses a few years ago.
    - Lisa: Eliminating more of the UAA could cover the cost of making AEC more readily available. Angelo: This is similar to how secure destruction was rolled out.
    - Chuck: is there benefit in looking at the pricing again to make the costs more enticing for users? Earl: sure.
  - NPF presentation/Panel

- Charles: it's been proposed to do an AEC session at NPF. Shows the process and the benefit.
  - PCC/presentation in a box?
    - Ellie: it would be good to do a webinar or PCC presentation to reach those who don't get to NPF.
    - Address management posts NPF presentations to RIBBS.
    - PCC committee tries to convert NPF information for local use.
- USPS handling of multiple names (Issue 135)
  - Special terms like C/O
  - Adam: came up in discussions on how NCOA handles multiple names. What are all the special terms that USPS takes action on? Kai is working on a list.
- Update on Temporary Away on microstrategy reports
  - Temp away is currently being counted toward move update errors on the reports today. These will be pulled out in a later release of the microstrategy reports.
- ACS/NCOALink variations
  - Lisa/Mike Tate ACS vs NCOALink presentation  
[https://ribbs.usps.gov/nfpresentations/documents/tech\\_guides/2014/NCOAandACS.ptx](https://ribbs.usps.gov/nfpresentations/documents/tech_guides/2014/NCOAandACS.ptx)
  - NCOALink finds about 75% of ACS data, concern is misdirecting mail
    - The "sweet spot" for NCOALink is for it to return about ¾ of moves. This ensures we don't move the mail unnecessarily.
    - Adam: it might be worthwhile to look at some of the NCOA rules to see if there are more match types that are safe. Examples: looking for a family move after the middle name match fails, or using each part of a hyphenated last name after the full last isn't matched. Also, might want to match daily deletes to a person rather than an address.
- New OIG report/audit (Issue 135)
  - <https://www.uspsoig.gov/sites/default/files/document-library-files/2014/it-ar-14-010.pdf>
  - OIG audited the entire NCOA system, including NCOALink. 3 recommendations on internal systems, 6 external. USPS pushed back on license agreement changes.
  - USPS did agree to get updated information from licensees. Will also ask for current contacts from each licensee and security procedures. Will re-start on-site reviews, the Inspection Service would be conducting the reviews.
  - Adam: It sounded like they were asking for more details than we previously provided. Some of the documentation requirements are unclear.
  - Charles: we will find the "bad actors" who aren't filling out PAFs or filling them out incorrectly. Report suggested that licensees shouldn't be allowed to transmit files via FTP, USPS disagrees.
  - Everyone, please read the report and let us know if there are any items that need to be discussed in UG5.
  - Adam: Some of the language implied that the data hash would need to be updated? The PAF form process – how can this process be automated? Charles: might even create a fourth layer for list owners to fill out their part of the PAF, which could be combined

with the broker/admin data. This could create some privacy for admins/brokers, but would come at a cost. OIG likes the idea of a “digital vault” for the PAFs.

- Chuck K: Does the Inspector Service have trained personnel to do these audits? Charles: We’re targeting April 2015, and training is part of the discussion. Chuck: would they be looking at the internal software workings? Charles: still working this out.
- UAA label codes (yellow labels)
  - <https://ribbs.usps.gov/index.cfm?page=moveupdate>
  - Posted files outline what the returns look like for PARS vs CFS.
- Open discussion
  - No topics.