

ACS returns that have gender related issues for Individual marked moves:

EXAMPLE: Mailed to:

Jane Smith
123 Main Street
Schaumburg, IL 60173-4839

ACS Return for this record as sent by the USPS on the ACS file to the client:

John M Smith
12345 Martin Luther King Blvd, Apt 12
Orlando, FL 32801

The issues with these ACS returned moves are:

1. Jane Smith is the consumer mailed to; The mailer didn't know who John Smith is as it is not on the mailer database.
2. The mailer could also offer credit to its client base. Now, with these moves coming back the mailer is confused and is fearful of wrongfully changing the name to meet Move Update requirements and save a few cents per mailpiece. Mailers could face civil lawsuits in this scenario as could the USPS since it is giving out new addresses for "not mailed" recipients. There are strong privacy concerns here for both the mailer and USPS because of "human error" and data quality issues (or plain "Quality Control" issues).
3. Nowhere in USPS Publication 8-A (which deals with ACS moves) does it address name issues and what a mailer should apply or suppress much less what it should accept or reject to be Move Update compliant.

NCOA^{Link} handles the above as follows:

Input record to NCOA^{Link}:

Jane Smith
123 Main Street
Schaumburg, IL 60173-4839

NCOA^{Link} output is: **Nothing because no move has occurred for the individual person whom the mailer addressed the original mailpiece to.**

Since the NCOA^{Link} database is "SHA" (Secure Hash Algorithm) encrypted it cannot decode a match. ACS makes the match according to Postal officials as "Human Error". Industry is concerned that this issue also reflects matching logic issues on MERLIN where raw data (i.e. Non "SHA" matching logic occurs) is used to decide whether or not a move should have occurred.