

UG-5  
April 8<sup>th</sup> 2015  
Agenda

- Work Group 171
  - Update: Met April 1, adding definitions to the update codes. A representative from Delivery has been able to fill out additional use cases. Getting good information, but the project is just starting.
  
- Micro-Strategy Reporting Errors.
  - What are people seeing?
    - Reports so far are that quite a few of the errors are USPS problems.
    - SteveK: Data was consistent for a while, then went up sharply in January. There were several increases in errors since then.
    - SharonH: Most of the errors we have seen have been USPS issues, nothing that a mailer could do to increase quality.
    - It would be good to have some insight into what changes are going in and when. This data can be viewed using the trending reports. [Instructions for how to view accompany the minutes]
    - SharonH: we're seeing some differences in name matching logic between ACS and NCOALink. It would be good to know what the differences are.
    - There are issues when the original or new address doesn't CASS certify. Some of this is due to the way the move was entered. If we move more moves to the online tool, will that increase the quality?
    - What USPS group manages the errors being fed to the microstrategy reports? Memphis? Angela or Jim would need to answer this. UG5 Leadership will discuss this offline.
    - PARS/FPARS is not frequently updated, once for military, and 2 years before that.
    - We'll continue this discussion next time.
  - Future Enhancement / Releases
  
- Secure Destruction
  - Participation has been low. Suggested a promotion for 2016.
  
- CASS August cycle – driving factors to start a new cycle?
  - No input yet,
  
- FPARS
  - Kai adding to FPARS to existing flow
  - Just started testing FPARS on live mail, no results yet. Testing will continue next 2 weeks.
  - Form 3579 will start looking different as a result of this.
  - Barcode read for Periodicals and other flats is very high.
  
- NCOA 100 Record Rule

- “What are some “conceptual alternatives”
  - Will be taking this to AMEE and MMA.
  - Will there be a discussion with legal? Once we have the alternatives documented, we will bring legal in.
- USPS handling of multiple names with special terms (c/o, etc) (Issue 135)  
List of name handling from **(Kai working with Adam)**
    - No updates.
- TT 23 Update:
    - New completion date is Sept 30<sup>th</sup>.
- 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.
- Other topics:
    - Any movement on the college and universities addition to CASS? DennisK will send info to Dan.

### **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.