

UG-5  
March 25<sup>th</sup> 2015  
Notes

- Work Group 171
  - Every Opposite Wednesday 12:30 CST
  - Mission & Desired Outcome
  - Attendee List (please let leadership know if you would like to participate)
  - The currently published finish date will likely be pushed out.
  
- 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
  - Nothing new this week.
  
- CASS August cycle – driving factors to start a new cycle?
  - Postal doesn't see that a CASS Cycle is warranted at this time
  - Any cycle we start now would be effective in 2017.
  - Sharon: will need to review with internal teams to see if there are any driving factors.
  - PB: we released the Cycle O software options, but our customers aren't making the switch because it isn't mandated.
  - Kim: everyone should review their internal needs to see if there is anything to drive a new cycle from an end user, postal or vendor perspective. Anyone who has input please send it to UG5 leadership for consideration. We'll talk about this as a group in June.
  
- FPARS
  - Kai adding to FPARS to existing flow
  
- NCOA 100 Record Rule
  - "What are some "conceptual alternatives"
    - Dan to also surface at AMEE
  - Chuck: there are some easy ways to get around these rules, so can this rule really be effective?
  - Sharon: it unnecessarily impacts those of us trying to follow the rules.
  - Chuck: it might be good to start with the Full-Service NCOA vendors as presumably USPS has high trust in them.
  
- USPS handling of multiple names with special terms (c/o, etc) (Issue 135)  
List of name handling from **(Kai working with Adam)**  
Haven't connected on this yet.

- TT 23: working through the issues, but the finish date is likely going to be moved out, there's still a lot to do.
- AEC I/II: session slated for Wednesday at NPF. This will be a panel, Dan O'Brien and Angela are currently scheduled, looking for another panelist.

### **Suggested – Future Agenda Topics From the Membership**

- Move Update at Point of Account Entry
  - Could possibly use an ANK-like flag at point of entry to identify pieces that are not current. This could help prevent fraud. Is this of interest to anyone?
  - This was proposed in 2010 as COAlert.
  - Not much interest expressed on the phone.
- DSMART
  - DSMART helps get addresses updated in AMS.
  - Sharon: could we use DSMART to help eliminate UAA? Could we start getting notification of known bad addresses? It could get flagged in CASS software.
  - It's hard to know, even with volume, whether the address is really UAA or just inactive.
  - Sharon: we're getting bad data through ACS. Missing primaries, etc.
  - Angela: ACS records are sent through CASS, but fulfill anyway. Does industry want these addresses that don't code? We assumed that industry would filter the results.
  - The online COA submissions are much cleaner due to the extra checks. But only 35% of COAs come in through online.
  - Sharon: how can we drive adoption of online COA since it is cleaner? Online COA costs \$1.05, paper submissions are free. Perhaps if paper were more expensive?
  - Angela: we should bring Audrey in on this discussion. She knows how we got to the \$1.05 amount for online submissions.
  - 96.07% of ACS COA were DPV=Y.
- 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.
  - Should this be in WG 143? Yes, and in TT 23. The issue is that the threshold is by the mail preparer CRID, not by mailing. Not all mailings by a eDoc submitter will be under legal restraint.
- 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?
  - The carrier identified logic in ACS is more lenient.
  - We've covered this in NPF sessions and in the UG, is more needed here?
- What is the latest status on the ACS Free for all products (Non-auto & SP)?
  - Currently offered only for mailers who are at least 75% Full-Service. This was documented in the Federal Register.
- 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.

- Ken Metroff: we were told by our vendor that using an '&' sign isn't allowable to match multiple names.
- Kai: I haven't heard of this, we'll look into it.
- 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
    - This was covered in a previous NPF session.
  - 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.
    - Angela will look for documentation.