From: Earley, Jr., James E.
  To: Thomas, Lottie <Thomas_Lottie@scdps.state.sc.us>
          Adams, Marcia S. <Adams_MarciaS@scdps.state.sc.us>
          Hicken, KathyLHicken_KathyL@scdps.state.sc.us
Date: 7/18/2002 12:53:59 PM
Subject: FW: MBH and REG Duplicate Titles
Attachments: MBH REG DUP RECORDS.xls
              MBH REG DUP TITLE NO.xls
              REG TO REG DUP TITLE NO.xls

FYI

-----Original Message-----
From: Kashuba, Buddy
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2002 11:38 PM
To: Patterson, Hattie C.
Cc: Dolder, Rolf P.; Tucker, Debra A.; Neiswonger, William D.; Earley, Jr., James E.; Yandle, Janice; bbriggs@caci.com
Subject: MBH and REG Duplicate Titles

As you all know, we have been struggling with duplication of title numbers and/or missing title numbers.

Here is a status update.

1. In Darl's research efforts into the legacy TITLE records, he managed, as a by-product to populate another 828,000+ missing title numbers in the REG file.

2. There are still 526,067 records (out of 5,907,466) that are vehicle type records but are missing the TITLE_NO. They will be assigned a made up title number of 'UNKnnnnnnnnnn'.

3. Hattie has made a request that when there is a duplicate TITLE_NO between MBH and REG, that we make the REG title number the primary and the MBH title number as the duplicate requiring a tie-breaker. This is the opposite of our current approach. Example

        '0000000000123'   Now will be the REG title number (as is)
        'A000000000123'   Now will become the MBH modified title number.

We will make the switch as per Hattie's request.

4. We have had past problems with duplicated title numbers within the MBH file. Because this was creating such heartburn to the bridging, cleansing and conversion strategies, we got Hattie's acquiescence to just "drop" these duplicates from the conversion process. The list was provided to DMV.

5. A wrinkle has arisen regarding POINT #2. When titles are "IN SUSPENSE", they still have not been assigned a title number. In the conversion scheme of things, they are sitting with an UNKnnnnnnnnnn type of number. Janice has kindly advised us that this is unacceptable. The new plan is as follows. Debra will provide the most current IN SUSPENSE list from legacy just prior to final conversion. We will then mark all these in suspense records on the BVEHREG table. As we create the title record, the UNK number will be massaged into an acceptable title number. Example.

     UNK0000001234 will become 4440000001234   "4" was the legacy "in-suspense" code ... hence the choice

6. After all the updating of title numbers in the REG file by Darl, we now have 19,589 cases of duplicate title numbers internal to the REG file. It is attached. The worst case instance is 4 duplicates. For such cases they will be assigned the A/B/C/etc qualifier. Example of the 4 duplicate case (title number is 27729308)

     A000027729308
     B000027729308
     C000027729308
     D000027729308

7. Finally, down to what triggered this memo. In trying to settle down the records in preparation for final conversion, we

again ran across yet another complication. I believe we have raised the flag previously ... that there appear to be duplicate records between the REG and MBH. They were discovered as a by-product of locating duplicate title numbers between the two files. The number of duplicate title numbers between the two files is 2,773. The more significant point is that at least 529 of them seem to represent the same "vehicle". Both of these spreadsheets are also attached.

Now what?

Option #1. Double create the records ... once as a reg based vehicle and once as an MBH based vehicle with no reg attached. This is what the conversion code is presently doing as the default.

Option #2. Mark these 529 obvious MBH duplicates as not convertible.

Option #3. Drop all duplications of duplicate title numbers between the two files. The 2,773 number.

Option #4. Other?

Buddy