

UG5 Agenda 05/06

Notes from last time in black, new notes in blue.

- Colleges and Universities
 - Update

Current policy is a college is defined as a business. The mail addressed to a business delivery point is the property of that business. USPS does not accept changes of address from individuals to/from a business address. This is tricky as the college/university is both a business and a residence. Looked at this opportunity via MTAC years ago. Implementing this might invite changes from nursing homes, extended stay hotels, etc. Still discussing this with NACUMS. Chuck K: why would this be a problem for USPS? JimW: it's a policy challenge. USPS requires that the school forwards the mail. Adam: who would we talk to about this requirement? JimW: operations, customer service and legal. DavidG: Is this more of the colleges not wanting to give up the responsibility, or USPS not wanting to take it? JimW: USPS would prefer to deliver to as few locations as possible. Delivering to each dorm room, etc would have significant cost impact. ChuckK: if the university mail room approved each move request, would that remove the risk? JimW: I can't speak for all areas of USPS. Dennisk: is there something from the military changes that could work in this case? JimW: The difference is the military postal service is considered an extension of USPS. ShawnB: if the universities had entries for the dorms, but mail is dropped at a central location. JimW: we do have this information for some institutions. This isn't a technical issue. ChuckK: could we bring the policy decision makers into this discussion? JimW: it might be better to work through MTAC leadership.
 - Thom: does the filing of moves have to be tied to adding more delivery points for USPS? University mail rooms already have a list of moves, but then USPS have to handle the piece twice. Kai: we just need to look at all the intricacies of mail going to colleges.
- NCOA 100 Record Rule (
 - "What are some "conceptual alternatives"
 - KimM: send any ideas you might have to UG5. One idea was to revive COAlert, which would flag an address with a move. JimW: technically this could work, but again these are policy issues, not technical.
 - Dennisk: can I take all the small customers and merge into one list, process as myself if I'm not returning the data to my customers? JimW: if we can create a system that ensures that this only happens in that environment, we might be able to talk about this. SharonH: can there be something that is added to the licensing that could streamline the process.
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-

-
- Subgroup Volunteers
 - Colleges & Universities
 - Thom Roylance
 - Dennis Kaylor
 - Robert Nashwick
 - Jason Kiefer
 - Adam Collinson
 - Jody Berenblatt
 - Richard Schmidt
 -
 - NCOA 100 Record Rule
 - Carmen DiQuollo
 - Robert Nashwick
 - Dennis Kaylor
 - Jason Kiefer
 - Kim Mauch
 - Sharron Harrison
 - Adam Collinson
 - Richard Schmidt
 - Jody Berenblatt
- Microstrategy thresholds
 - Error/anomaly drivers
 - Makeup of 0.8% tolerance
 - System limitations
 - Mailer-controllable items
 - Error vs anomaly
 - JimW: this issue is due to the differences between NCOALink and ACS. Mailers are interpreting the “errors” on the scorecard
 - SharonH: we understand that there are differences. However, we’re updating based on the data and it is creating issues as the ACS data isn’t always reliable. We understand that most mailers are under the threshold. But we’re using the data to resolve issues on our end. We did an in-depth analysis and found that all the errors were from the data on the USPS side. JimW: this was initially conveyed as a scorecard issue, but it sounds like an addressing issue. From that perspective, we have different way to move forward. We’d love to have 100% accuracy, but that isn’t realistic. Dan: part of the confusion could be that these are labeled as errors. JimW: it might be better to call these exceptions. SharonH: it would be useful to have someone from delivery involved in this discussion so we can communicate the issues. JimW: if we want to eliminate addresses that don’t DPV from ACS, that needs to be agreed to by all the industry. JimW: how do we identify the low-hanging fruit to tackle first? ChuckK: is the ACS information run through a CASS process? JimW: yes, but it is not filtered for the DPV confirmed flag. Several: I don’t know what I can do with an address that doesn’t DPV. AdamC: sometimes the information might be the only thing that can help locate that customer. DavidG: this might be something to build into the business rules for managing ACS feedback. SharonH: this is especially troublesome when there’s no street address

returned. JimW: we should do some work to discover what percentage we're seeing with these issues. SharonH: it might be useful to have a confidence/quality indicator with the returned address. AdamC: sometimes these non-DPV addresses are just new, but many never wind up with a verifiable address. JimW: is there something that can be improved with software changes/more frequent data updates? ChrisL: now that we're in EPF, we could queue up that conversation. AdamC: another tactic is to look at the COAs that are filed with deliverable but non-codable addresses (building name vs address, extraneous data, etc). It would be good to look at the COA form and encourage more online usage.

- o Next steps: get a list of problem areas and prioritize based on frequency.
- o Kim: USPS will be filing a Federal Register Notice in the next 60 days to hopefully clear up some of the areas of ambiguity. (see below for screenshots from the MTAC webinar today)



Move Update Clarification Requested

- User Group 5 raised concerns that there is no authoritative documentation regarding the inclusion in Move Update of below change-of-address (COA) records:
 - Moved-Left-No-Address (MLNA)
 - Box-Closed-No- Order (BCNO)
 - Foreign Moves
 - Handling of Legal Restraint in SASP assessment
- Address Management preparing a Federal Register to state policy on these change-of-address types regarding Move Update
 - Clarification of Legal Restraint handling in SASP to be included
- Inclusion of UAA due to a change-of-address greater than 18-months and NCOALink return codes 5, 14, 19 in SASP assessment
 - Impact of NCOALink return codes not significant at ~ 0.03% - 0.05%
 - Exclusion of COAs from Move Update in above situations not practical



ACS Data Quality Issues

- Discussions in User Group 5 on quality of ACS records
 - New addresses that do not DPV validate as complete addresses
 - Variation between Internet Change-of-Address and PS Form 3575
 - Consistency of UAA reason codes
 - Consistency of ACS records with NCOALink data
- Consideration of suppressing ACS records that fail quality checks
 - No clear consensus within mailing industry
- Increase customer use of Internet Change-of-Address
- Standardization of UAA reason codes to improve quality
 - No clear consensus within mailing industry
- Cross-check incoming ACS records using NCOALink



Change-of-Address Data Quality Initiatives

- Address hygiene processes currently in use to standardize change-of-address data include:
 - CASS address matching
 - Address Element Correction
 - Electronic Uncoded Address Resolution (eUARS) review by field
- Address Management to review addition of *ACS Quality Indicator* in the ACS record to enable mailer to design business rules on whether to include or exclude record
 - Availability in Full Service ACS to be determined
 - Quality checks may impact timeliness of fulfillment



Comparison of Address Quality by COA Entry Method

ICOA			
Total	DPV	Secondary Deficient	Does not DPV
24,930,627	24,192,597	616,816	121,214
	97.0%	2.5%	0.5%
HARDCOPY			
Total	DPV	Secondary Deficient	Does not DPV
36,668,417	35,001,410	1,284,840	382,167
	95.45%	3.50%	1.04%
COMBINED			
Total	DPV	Secondary Deficient	Does not DPV
61,599,044	59,194,007	1,901,656	503,381
	96.10%	3.09%	0.82%

19

- WG 171 Update
 - Kai: Had the first meeting last week, planning to sunset in August.
 - Kai: This group is just getting started.
- Micro-Strategy Reporting Errors.
 - What are people seeing? (covered above)
- PARS/FPARS is not frequently updated, once for military, and 2 years before that.
 - Future Enhancement / Releases
 - PARS/ FPARS flow (Kai) This has not yet been completed, will revisit next meeting.
 - Kai: Reviewed the FPARS flowchart.
 - Carmen: Do we have a sense on timing? Kai: Testing is continuing. In a perfect world, the intent is to start deployment before the end of the summer. Deploy will take 6-8 weeks.

- TT 23 Update:
 - New completion date is Sept 30th. AdamC: has been presenting changes to UG1, USPS has completed their testing.
 - Adam: Reporting to the Microstrategy group, USPS is finishing up testing. They reviewed the test plan for the industry which should be available for wider review at a later time.

- Industry Alert (April 23rd 8:09am cst)
 - Military Mail Addressing: Be sure to read the upcoming April 30, 2015 edition of the *Postal Bulletin* on updated standards for military mail addressing requirements. In conjunction with the Navy and the Military Postal Service Agency, the Postal Service will revise the APO and FPO address format to more closely align with Postal and other military addressing standards – using the “UNIT,” “CMR,” or “PSC” designation and number, plus the box number as part of the addressing component. The use of the ship’s name to reach its destination will no longer be permitted. These addressing standards are effective June 1, 2015, with a full compliance date required by October 2015. Help us get the word out to military families!
 - JimW: this is a non-issue for the mailing industry. This is a new military requirement for their sailors on ships. All of these forms of addressing are currently supported by CASS. ShawnB: there may be some addresses that certify today that will no longer match and there’s no way to correct them.