



## Appendix C: Quick Hits Detailed Analysis

### Contact Information

<b>Date:</b>	7/17/03
<b>Author(s):</b>	Rhonda Singleton, Pam Eliadis
<b>Phone Number:</b>	202-962-0782, 202-377- 3554

### Data Quality Mad Dog Information

<b>Mad Dog Issue Number:</b> 23	
<b>Business Entities Affected:</b> Trading Partners	<b>Is this a "Quick Hit" (Y or N):</b> Y

#### 1. Please indicate a general description of the data quality issue:

The FFEL data reported to NSLDS by the Guaranty Agency submitters is not reported at a consistent or timely interval to enable quality analytics. In addition, the infrequency of the feed schedule does not allow the most current information to be available.

External Data Providers submit information to NSLDS at a pre-arranged interval that varies by agency allowing time for the agencies to run the necessary production to get the information sent and for NSLDS to get the information on to their system. If a user is not aware of this schedule users may not have access and information that is obtained for report/analysis may be incomplete, inaccurate, or out dated.



**2. Please indicate a general description of the recommended solution, related scope of work and dependencies?**

This issue may be resolved through educating data users regarding the feed schedule so that users understand when the most complete and correct data is available. However, in addition to user education, a more frequent (weekly) feed schedule should be considered

Recommend that the various Data Provider Production Schedule be made available to users

Currently schools can see when the most current data will be available on NSLDS by viewing the Data Provider Production Schedule via the NSLDS website. For other external entities, recommend that the calendar be posted to IFAP and on the FP portal.

Internally, the schedule is not easily accessible. Recommend that the Production Schedule be made available to internal users of NSLDS information. Requires a security change on the NSLDS web page to "turn on" the view to Ed users. Also recommend that the entire production schedule including DL, DMCS and SSCR feeds, be posted so that Ed users can determine the best time to capture the most up to date information for the data they are collecting.

There may not be a way to arrange for timelier reporting under the current reporting format. While the benefit of more frequent feeds is not disputed, consideration must be given to the impact to the data providers. Currently ED does not require data providers to submit any more frequently than monthly or quarterly. In order to get more frequent feeds Ed would need to change the current requirements and this will have a huge impact on the providers. For example one guarantor has production runs, including but not exclusive of the NSLDS feed, that take an entire weekend to complete. It must be done over the weekend because it affects their access to the information. The guarantor uses every weekend to accomplish the various feeds they must do. Increasing the feeds to NSLDS would impact their cost, man power and access to their own information decreasing their efficiency.

A redesign being considered would address the reporting format and possibly allow for more frequent reporting but it is at least 3-5 yrs out. Recommend that we keep this issue on the radar for that effort.



**3. What business areas does this initiative impact?**

Lifecycle Stages impacted by this issue are Institution Participation and Servicing  
Systems impacted are Trading Partners, NSLDS, FSA Analysts

**4. What additional data quality issues (if any) are addressed by this recommendation?**

*Issue # 4 - Information about loans held by Guaranty Agencies for collections (defaulted but not assigned) is not being reported at a high level of accuracy*

This issue is also related to Guaranty Agency reporting. Any changes implemented for issue #4 should consider the impact on Issue #23

**5. What are the estimated costs of the initiative? (choose one)**

**\$0 - \$50,000**      \$50,000 - \$100,000      \$100,000 - \$500,000      >\$500,000

**6. What is the estimated time required to implement? (choose one)**

**0 - 3 months**      3-6 months      6-12 months      >12 months

**7. What are the impacts of not addressing this issue?**

More accurate and up to date information available for analytics and reports will enable the user to create a current picture or climate of the program, aid in the ability to forecast successes and determine revisions necessary for the enterprise. It is important to know that if information is not exactly the same in all locations, it is clear as to why. Educating the users of the data on the best way to collect up to date and accurate information allows for more efficient analytics and reporting.

Considering a revision of reporting formats and frequency would ensure information is 'refreshed' more frequently allowing more current information to be available to more users.



### Additional Comments

N/A



### Contact Information

<b>Date:</b>	7/17/03
<b>Author(s):</b>	Heather Burrs, Steve Martus, Adele Gabrielli
<b>Phone Number:</b>	202-962-0859, 202-377-3317, 202-377-3299

### Data Quality Mad Dog Information

<b>Mad Dog Issue Number:</b> 25	
<b>Business Entities Affected:</b> School	<b>Is this a "Quick Hit" (Y or N):</b> Y

#### 1. Please indicate a general description of the data quality issue:

The school data in DMCS, specifically institution demographic information, is static. The DMCS system received an update of the school demographic information over a year ago and has not gotten systematic updates since.

DMCS needs accurate school demographic information, including a valid school ID. This information is pivotal to the collections business process. DMCS accepts loans for assignment and servicing based on a number of edits, one of which is if the school ID submitted by the assigning entity is "valid". If there is no matching school ID on the DMCS database, the school identifier is considered to be invalid, and the loan is rejected. When this occurs, it is impossible for DMCS to accept the loan for assignment/servicing.

When loans are rejected by DMCS, an error file is sent to the submitting entities: DLSS (Direct Loans), Guaranty Agencies (FFEL Loans), and Schools (Perkins Loans). These entities are responsible for reviewing the error files for debts that have been rejected by DMCS, correcting the errors and resubmitting the debts. Unfortunately, since the school IDs have not been updated, DMCS will continue to reject the resubmitted debts.



**2. Please indicate a general description of the recommended solution, related scope of work and dependencies?**

DMCS should receive school demographic information periodically in a consistent, systematic way. To accomplish this, PEPS can send DMCS the school file. Necessary actions must be taken so that when the file is received, its contents can be successfully read into the DMCS system. There are various options that DMCS can execute regarding the receipt and processing of the Daily School File. For example, Collections personnel can determine the frequency of receipt; one that best reflects their need for school demographic updates. They may also choose to process and store only those records that have changed since the file was received last. Other FSA systems take this approach, reading only the change records from the Daily School File.

It was noted that DMCS will need to receive and process the entire file initially. After the initial transfer it may only need to receive updated school demographic data monthly. Since PEPS normally sends out the School File on a daily basis, they may have to make some minor adjustments to deliver it monthly to DMCS.

As mentioned above, the majority of the effort would be on the DMCS side. They will need to ensure that the school records, when received from PEPS, are processed correctly. This issue and its proposed solution only affect PEPS and DMCS.



**3. What business areas does this initiative impact?**

Lifecycle stages impacted are Institution Participation and Servicing.  
Systems impacted are DMCS, PEPS

**4. What additional data quality issues (if any) are addressed by this recommendation?**

There is currently no means within the enterprise to consistently identify a Trading Partner so that data from multiple stores within FSA can be aggregated for viewing or research (Issue #8). If DMCS contains outdated school information, the enterprise view of institutions may not contain accurate collections data and will be fragmented.

**5. What are the estimated costs of the initiative? (choose one)**

**\$0 - \$50,000**      \$50,000 - \$100,000      \$100,000 - \$500,000      >\$500,000

**6. What is the estimated time required to implement? (choose one)**

**0 - 3 months**      3-6 months      6-12 months      >12 months

**7. What are the impacts of not addressing this issue?**

DMCS will hold school demographic data that is out of sync. Time and resources may be wasted as a result of working with incorrect and/or outdated information. Most importantly, loans with valid school identifiers will continue to be rejected by DMCS. When loans are rejected unnecessarily, the collection process, which is essential to FSA's business, is significantly hindered. This will occur as long as DMCS does not have the most current school demographic information.



### Additional Comments

There may be a similar issue with Lender demographic information; sometimes loans are rejected because DMCS does not have the most recent lender demographic information. It was noted that currently DMCS's Lender File is being manually updated by Financial Partners personnel. This issue should be explored further to determine how to receive more regular, automated (e.g. tape/EFT) updates. This would help ensure that DMCS is receiving timely Lender demographic updates and that loans are not rejected due to an invalid lender ID, when in fact the ID is valid, just not on DMCS's ID table.

It should also be mentioned that the Common Services for Borrowers initiative may address this issue.



**Contact Information**

<b>Date:</b>	7/17/03
<b>Author(s):</b>	Heather Burrs, Gregory James, Paul Steinhauer, Nina Colon, Angeline Iwanicki
<b>Phone Number:</b>	202-962-0859, 202-377-3386, , 202-377-3384, 202-377-3237

**Data Quality Mad Dog Information**

<b>Mad Dog Issue Number:</b> 26	
<b>Business Entities Affected:</b> School, Lender, Guaranty Agency	<b>Is this a "Quick Hit" (Y or N):</b> Y

**1. Please indicate a general description of the data quality issue:**

Occasionally Trading Partners sign up for SAIG access and batch functions with "dummy" identifier values. Enrollment can occur via the SAIG Enrollment Web Site or by mailing in a paper form. Aside from their Department of Education issued identifiers (e.g. OPEID, GA Code, Lender ID, etc.) users must provide information such as SSN, date of birth, and mother's maiden name to sign up for services through participation management.

This information is used to authenticate a user when he or she performs secure activities within SAIG. These activities include resetting a password and viewing, modifying, deleting or adding enrollment services.

For all users that sign up of the SAIG Enrollment Web Site, these data fields are sent to the PIN system. These records are written to the PIN database and PINs are issued to all Participation Management users that enroll online. Trading Partner use these PINs to access FSA online functions such as FAA Access (CPS Online).

There are some instances when users sign up with dummy identifier values. These values include: SSNs of 111-11-1111 or 123-45-6789, mother's maiden names of Jones or Smith, and dates of birth of 01-01-2001. Currently, there are limited validity checks done on this information when it is entered on the Web Site.



**2. Please indicate a general description of the recommended solution, related scope of work and dependencies?**

The first step is to formally establish a policy prohibiting the use of inaccurate identifier information during enrollment. This policy should be officially communicated to Trading Partners that violate this policy. Currently, Trading Partners that use inaccurate information for enrollment receive a warning telephone call from CPS staff.

In tandem with a formal policy communication, validity checks for the information entered on the SAIG Enrollment Web Site should be implemented. These checks would test user input for values that are clearly incorrect, such as a Social Security Number of 111-11-1111. These front-end checks cannot completely eliminate “dummy” information; for example, a mother’s maiden name of Jones would still be accepted, but it should cut down on the number of occurrences. It has been noted that, since the documentation of this issue, there have been validity checks incorporated into the SAIG Enrollment Web Site. These checks are able to identify and eliminate certain incorrect SSN values such as 111-11-1111, 123-45-6789, and 987-65-4321. Although these checks are not exhaustive they do cut down on the entry of incorrect information. There are currently no front-end validity checks for other fields such as date of birth and mother’s maiden name.

The front-end validity checks mentioned above are not as comprehensive as performing a Social Security Number match. In order to more effectively reduce the number of invalid IDs, users’ information could be verified with the Social Security Administration. Although this check provides a thorough solution, the need for this type of authentication, taking cost in to consideration, should be explored.



**3. What business areas does this initiative impact?**

This issue impacts all stages of the Lifecycle. Also impacted are Trading Partners, Participation Management, and PIN. Because schools use this ID for everything they do via SAIG, this issue has impact on all FSA systems that utilize SAIG services

**4. What additional data quality issues (if any) are addressed by this recommendation?**

N/A

**5. What are the estimated costs of the initiative? (choose one)**

**\$0 - \$50,000**

\$50,000 - \$100,000

\$100,000 - \$500,000

>\$500,000

**6. What is the estimated time required to implement? (choose one)**

**0 - 3 months**

3-6 months

6-12 months

>12 months

**7. What are the impacts of not addressing this issue?**

SAIG users will continue to enroll on the SAIG Enrollment Web Site with incorrect identifiers. When users have "dummy" identifiers, it is more likely that these identifiers will be distributed and used by others within the organization. People are less likely to distribute their actual SSN and mother's maiden name. In instances where one person is approved for certain SAIG functions, many people may utilize this capability using the approved person's identifiers.

Records with incorrect identifiers will continue to be passed to CPS for processing and stored on the PIN database. Separate data cleanup efforts will be needed as long as information is not verified before being written to the database.

In general, not addressing this issue will raise security concerns, creating a soft spot for fraudulent or unapproved activities. Without proper identifiers and access and enrollment controls, there is no individual or institutional accountability.



### Additional Comments

This issue is closely tied with the Access and Enrollment piece of the Data Strategy. The Access and Enrollment initiative is reviewing FSA's existing offerings for Enrollment and Access Management as well as formulating a high-level design for a new vision.

It was mentioned that incorporating Social Security Administration verification into the SAIG Enrollment process is currently being investigated by other FSA initiatives.



---

### Contact Information

<b>Date:</b>	7/14/03
<b>Author(s):</b>	Rhonda Singleton, Mike Sutphin, Frank Ramos
<b>Phone Number:</b>	202-962-0782, 202-377-3624, 202-377-3330

### Data Quality Mad Dog Information

<b>Mad Dog Issue Number:</b> 28	
<b>Business Entities Affected:</b> Trading Partners	<b>Is this a "Quick Hit" (Y or N):</b> Y

#### 1. Please indicate a general description of the data quality issue:

The Account Maintenance Fees for Guaranty Agencies is forecasted for three quarters. The fourth quarter is used to "true up" the actual Account Maintenance Fee due to the Guarantor. It is unclear how these transactions are reconciled or monitored. There is also some question as to how VFA Fee Payments and Performance Measures are monitored and reconciled.



**2. Please indicate a general description of the recommended solution, related scope of work and dependencies?**

It is confirmed that there are reconciliation and monitoring tools in place for AMF and VFA Payments. Currently the guidelines are included in the Financial Partner Guaranty Agency Review Guide. This information and where it is published needs to be communicated to both external and internal users via scheduled regional meetings and emails respectively.

The Mad Dog group assigned to this issue collected the following information regarding the AMF and VFA fees:

As previously stated, the Account Maintenance Fee is estimated based on the first three quarters, and then the fourth quarter is used to "true up" the actual guaranty amount. For the fourth quarter reconciliation, NSLDS sends AMF numbers to FMS who uses the data to calculate final payment. FMS generates invoices that are reported to Ed CFO for Treasury disbursements to guarantors. Treasury then sends confirmation to FMS via Ed CFO.

For each fiscal year the FSA has a specific amount of funds allotted to pay Account Maintenance Fees to Guarantors. If the total amount due to Guarantors exceeds the amount allotted to FSA, Guarantors are instructed to transfer funds from the Federal Fund to their Operating Fund. A letter is sent to the organization advising of, the amount they have guaranteed, the amount they have received to date, and the amount still due them. They are advised how much will be paid to them from Treasury and are further instructed to pay themselves from the Federal Fund to reconcile any difference between the amount paid by FSA and the total amount due.

As this issue relates to the VFA Fee Payments and the Performance Measures, the process is somewhat more manually regulated by the External Regional Reviewers. The Reviewers visit guarantors and perform a variety of audits on different areas of the business, including, the VFA Fee Payments and Performance Measures. Guaranty Agencies are paid a fee for the work they do (VFA Fee) and the more they do correctly the more money they make (Performance Measure). The fees are calculated on a volume scale. The benchmarks they must meet for each activity is documented. Agencies go online and submit their request for payment via a section of the Forms 2000. FSA reviews to ensure that the calculations are correct and justified based on the reviewers reports etc.



**3. What business areas does this initiative impact?**

The Lifecycle Stage impacted is Institution Participation. The systems impacted by this issue are NSLDS, Ed CFO, FMS, Participation Management, Treasury, AR/AP, GL. Also impacted are Regional Reviewers.

**4. What additional data quality issues (if any) are addressed by this recommendation?**

N/A

**5. What are the estimated costs of the initiative? (choose one)**

**\$0 - \$50,000**      \$50,000 - \$100,000      \$100,000 - \$500,000      >\$500,000

**6. What is the estimated time required to implement? (choose one)**

**0 - 3 months**      3-6 months      6-12 months      >12 months

**7. What are the impacts of not addressing this issue?**

Better understanding of the procedures utilized within FSA will allow for improved use of the information, facilitating more accurate analytics and a more effective level of oversight, therefore, more effective and efficient service and to internal and external customers.



### Additional Comments

N/A



---

### Contact Information

<b>Date:</b>	7/18/3
<b>Author(s):</b>	Pam Eliadis, Rhonda Singleton
<b>Phone Number:</b>	202-377- 3554, 202-962-0782

### Data Quality Mad Dog Information

<b>Mad Dog Issue Number:</b> 29	
<b>Business Entities Affected:</b> Aid School, Person, Trading Partner	<b>Is this a "Quick Hit" (Y or N):</b> Y

#### 1. Please indicate a general description of the data quality issue:

Anomalous Names - NSLDS has 13,000 records with numbers in the first and/or last names. For example, #1 used for lower case L or zero for the letter O. This error can prevent record matches.



**2. Please indicate a general description of the recommended solution, related scope of work and dependencies?**

As part of the Data Strategy initiative, the Standard Student Identification Method (SSIM) team is examining the matching problems presented in this issue in greater detail and currently creating an Implementation Approach that will detail potential methods to alleviate issues such as these. The SSIM team has verified that this error may already be corrected in the proposed algorithm and that if not, the necessary code will be added. The Implementation Approach Deliverable is scheduled for completion in September 2003.



**3. What business areas does this initiative impact?**

Lifecycle Stages impacted are Delivery and Servicing. Systems impacted the most are NSLDS, DLSS, COD, Financial Partners, Schools.

**4. What additional data quality issues (if any) are addressed by this recommendation?**

N/A

**5. What are the estimated costs of the initiative? (choose one)**

**\$0 - \$50,000**      \$50,000 - \$100,000      \$100,000 - \$500,000      >\$500,000

**6. What is the estimated time required to implement? (choose one)**

**0 - 3 months**      3-6 months      6-12 months      >12 months

**7. What are the impacts of not addressing this issue?**

If systems are not able to properly identify and match records, errors will continue to generate. This creates the need for additional time and people resources to identify, research, and repair the errors.



### Additional Comments

N/A