

UG-5
March 11th 2015
Notes

- Introduction: Robert Nashwick – Manager, Address Technology (replaces Lisa West)
 - My email address is robert.j.nashwick@usps.gov and my phone number is 901-821-6182.
 - Status of USPS Delivery Manager
- UAA Return Codes
 - MTAC Workgroup request submitted (WG 171)
 - Note the recommended end date is likely after May 1.
 - Email Dan, Adam or Kai to be added.
 - Sharon: we should have someone from Delivery in this group.
 - This is the plan, resources are being identified.
 - Adam: there have been fulfillment issues with singlesource and other ACS services. This might be discouraging adoption.
- Secure Destruction
 - Participation has been a little low.
 - The highest volume site is Industry, CA. Government and telecom have been heavy adopters.
 - Information is available on RIBBS, and in a PCC workshop. Outreach continues through several avenues.
 - Sharon: we would suggest possibly trying a promotion to get mailers going on the program.
- FPARS
 - In the testing phases, haven't started running live mail yet. Periodicals will be included in this. Next phase is pre-production, in April. Deployment is intended in the July timeframe, through the end of the summer. PARS labels for flats will be white. The form 3579 will look slightly different for Periodicals. ACS for Full-Service Periodicals, the data will just be passed on.
 - Angelo: do you expect the read rates similar to letters? IT depends on the barcode. As long as it's legible, you should see similar results. Will there be any machines that don't get FPARS? There will be 18 plants with FPARS via AFSM 100. Will the label be the same as letters? The labels will be the same, the only difference will be the color.
 - Note the bundles will go to the carrier first, and will get kicked out for processing.
 - Dan: is there a process flow that could be shared? Not yet, will work on this.
- UAA rollup (dataset posted to RIBBS)
 - The UAA data is posted now:
https://ribbs.usps.gov/uaamail/documents/tech_guides/UAARollUp1998-2014.xls
 - Adam: for the first time in awhile, the amount of UAA went down, but that was mostly from Standard Mail.
- NCOA 100 Record Rule
 - Jim talked with Matthew, the Chief Privacy Officer. The 100 record rule was established back in 1988. There wasn't any specific discussion about it in the 90's. The requirement is that the list be updated, rather than the individual address. The rule ensures that USPS is not disclosing data other than for purposes of mailing. If we went off of 100, what would the number be? Note there are other ways to get the data, through ACS, etc. Adam: but to get that, you have to waste the cost of the full-price mailing.

- Sharon: our hope was to get a meeting with the CPO. Is the discussion closed? From a privacy standpoint, we do need to maintain this minimum. Sharon: all mailers have this problem, of all sizes. Was that represented in this conversation? Yes. Dan: would he be open to a call? Charles: I will ask. There are many mailers that combine lists to meet the minimum. There were questions about why we don't raise the minimum to the minimum for presort discounts. It might be useful to write a letter to encourage a discussion.
 - Robert asks Dan to gather some conceptual alternatives (to the 100 piece rule) from Industry for Matthew Connolly to review.
- USPS handling of multiple names with special terms (c/o, etc) (Issue 135)
List of name handling from **(Kai working with Adam)**

Suggested – Future Agenda Topics From the Membership

- Move Update Compliance for Legal Restraint is still not clear.
 - Presort vendors have identified issues.
 - Mailers may have some jobs that are Legal Restraint, but others that aren't
 - It still isn't clear what the USPS is doing with this approach.
- What is the status from USPS on building a technology /comparison and validation step between the ACS & NCOALink records provided to customers – for the USPS to further investigate and resolve issues where different responses are being generated for the same customer?
- What is the latest status on the ACS Free for all products (Non-auto & SP)?
- For Move-Update compliance, is there a way for the USPS to allow & signs to be processed for name matching capabilities? Without it – some are indicating they have matching issue.
- There is an interest to improve the communication of address change processes with the mailers. Can we ask the USPS to provide the following:
 - Walkthrough ACS & NCOALink Data process
 - Review how these relate to each other and share what is different
 - Review the process used by the USPS to provide ACS matches / Seamless Acceptance matches
 - Get a common understanding and documented data flow of how this works shared with industry so that it is clearer to understand it.