Overview:

Very few mailers are actually looking at the USPS Data and mailing quality reports today. There needs to be some motivation to the mailers to monitor their own quality. There should be some overall grade (or grades based on category) that a mailer gets for mailing and data quality based on a rolling average. This grade could be automatically monitored by USPS. When it falls below an acceptable threshold, the mailer would be automatically notified by email. They might also be notified if the rolling average starts to drop too fast. This would keep mailers and USPS on guard if the quality falls too low. All of this should be automatic. Before this can happen there needs to be a comprehensive report. The report defined below is a start. All reports should be reviewed and consolidated. In the end, the overall cost to the USPS will be less if there are fewer reports to maintain.

USPS reporting for mailing and data quality, visibility, FAST Appointments, start the clock, and Streamlined Acceptance are all being developed by different groups. From a mailer point of view, this creates confusion and complexity when trying to evaluate mailing and data quality. The industry has to go to several different reports to get an idea of the mailing and data quality. Efforts to educate the USPS on industry processing and reporting needs are lost from one project to the next.

In the past, reports have been presented to the industry after they have been coded. The result being that they do not provide the data in a format that is easily usable or understood. Changes to the reports are difficult or impossible, and very costly to the USPS. This development style was understandable when intelligent mail and eDoc was new to everyone. Something needed to be developed to get things started. Now the industry and USPS both have experience in these areas, we are better able to develop a workable comprehensive reporting strategy.

Most of the Full Service Intelligent Mail is dropped by large multi-site mailers. Yet the reports continue to be location based. From an enterprise view, we would like to see a report that summarizes and compares all centers by error type or category. This will allow the mailer's corporate headquarters to monitor the enterprise and quickly identify problem areas. There is a concept of such a report later in this document.

We request that a group consisting of industry and USPS be formed that evaluates all reporting requirements for the new world of Intelligent Mail and Streamlined Acceptance. This group would create a holistic reporting strategy based on the needs of the various USPS and industry stakeholders. Sub-groups would be created to focus on specific areas. In the end this approach will be the most effective and efficient way to accomplish reporting objectives for streamlined mail verification and acceptance. Fewer, well thought out reports will also reduce USPS development and maintenance costs. If the USPS is not interested in an industry wide effort, we offer our assistance as part of a smaller group.

The following pages represent a concept of what a comprehensive mailing data quality report might look like. There are also some general considerations that should be reviewed for all reports. These ideas need to be refined, but demonstrate the need for a centralized reporting strategy. If the reporting tools do not allow this type of report to be easily developed, we should work together to come up with a solution that works best for all parties.

Detailed Report Analysis

This report provides a comprehensive view of data quality by location. Large multi-location mailers represent most of the Full Service Mail. It is important that there are reports that quickly provide an enterprise view of quality by location.

In concept, the Mailing data Quality report could look similar to the Full Service CSA/STC spreadsheet that the USPS used to manually prepare for large industry mailers. The summary report will be a grid with a column for each location. All of the potential errors will be listed in the rows. Providing the errors in rows will allow the report to grow as new validations are added. The user will be able to click on a row or column header to drill down to more detail. This report could be used by mailers and USPS to identify and fix problems.

This document just covers the main report. We like the Dashboard graphs presented in the Streamlined Acceptance spreadsheet. We also think that there should be some type of overall quality measure report by category based on a rolling average. This would serve as an overall measurement of quality for a location. This indicator could be used by USPS to identify problem areas and as an indicator that a mailer needs some assistance.

Reporting Considerations for all reports:

1. Timing is everything. 48 hours is too long to wait for reports. Consider Monday's mailing. It is finalized sometime early Tuesday morning. Then add 48 hours to that time. Reports are not available until Thursday morning. Very often Thursdays mailing has already started. If there is a systemic problem, it will not be corrected until Friday's mailings. Reports should be available within two hours after finalization.

2. Identify the difference between warnings and errors at every level of the report. A current USPS report might show 15,000 errors. Upon drilling down we see only 3 errors and the rest are warnings that we can do nothing about. Warnings are often not at all relevant and just clutter the reports and distort the counts. This gives the impression that the reports are useless to mailers. An example of an irrelevant warning would be the DPV warning in the SASP reports.

3. For MLOCR reports, the mail owner is not relevant at the tray or container level and should not be included. Including the mail owner distorts the data in the reports. We see one tray counted 100 times in current reports. Once for each mail owner included in the commingled mail. As these tray counts are accumulated we might see 10,000 trays for 100,000 pieces of mail. This makes the reports unusable for us. Despite previous efforts to convey this concept, the most recent Start the Clock Reports were still designed this way.

4. Do not expose any tray or container errors or scan data from a commingled logical mailing to mail owners. This confuses them. For example, if a mail owner gives 500 pieces of national mail to a presort bureau, they could see tray data for 9000 trays and many containers. Since we do not know what tray or container a piece is in, the data is not relevant to the mail owner. eDoc is created by tray group, not the physical tray.

5. Where possible, identify if the error is caused by USPS, Mailer, or possibly both.

6. Where applicable, when drilling down, each lower level drill should include the key criteria from the higher levels, such as job name, mailing date, class, or other relevant data. This data is critical when exporting data

from the drill downs so that the detailed export can be properly identified back to its source. These might include Job Name, Mailing Date and Mail Class in the reports. Include Mailing Group ID if required.

7. Provide barcodes/scan details or images when applicable that are reported in error so drill down or troubleshooting can take place.

8. Distinguish between different mailing classes. First class mailings have very different start the clock expectations than standard class PVDS mail. Putting both on the same report confuses the data in most cases.

9. Upload time should be reduced. A recent preliminary submission of 3.5 million pieces took nearly 2 hours to validate, upload and process. The content update for the same mailing took 2.2 hours. This includes time for PO! to process the data. Our 10 million piece mailings take up to 10 hours.

10. From a mailer point of view there is one mailing. While the USPS has different departments to perform different functions, the industry would like to see the overall quality of "the mailing" in one report where possible.

Selection criteria:

These criteria will apply to all reports.

1. Date range. Defaulted to 30 days. Discussion item: Would this date range be for mailing date or scan date range?

2. One or all CRID's. Default to all.

3. May select all or part of a job name with wild card option. This would select all jobs starting with XXX. Default to all.

4. Mail class. Default to all.

5. Mail category (Letters, flats, periodicals, etc). Default to all.

6. Reporting Categories to be included in the report. Default to all.

7. Report errors, warnings or both. Default to all.

Reporting Categories:

1. Scan rates (Total, scanned, percent scanned)

    a. Container scan rates

    b. Tray scan rates

    c. Piece scan rates

2. Nesting/CSA

3. Location errors

4. Presort errors
5. Entry Verification Errors
    a. Postage payment
    b. Piece weight
    c. Other?
6. Start the clock rate
7. Undocumented (Total, Percent)
    a. Containers
    b. Trays
    c. Pieces

Overview report:

1. Mailing Data Quality Summary Report – Drill 0
    a. Use grid format
    b. One column per CRID. Perhaps use CRID and city/state as the header.
    c. Each row will have a different error type The errors would be grouped and subtotaled by reporting category. Reporting categories defined above. I am sure this is not a complete list. The general idea is that these categories are a summary of all errors grouped logically. Errors and warnings should be kept separate.
    d. If the number of validations becomes to numerous, offer the report in summery by category. Allow the user to expand one or more categories with a (+,-).
    e. Perhaps color code the rows and have warning rows at the end of the report. Warnings and errors should be kept distinctly separate at all levels of reporting.
    f. Quality presented as number of units with an error?
    g. Top rows shows total pieces and errors for the column. Next row shows total warnings for the column.
    h. Start the clock counts and percentages would be at the end of the report. Following the link will bring the user to the units that did not make STC and the reason why in a format similar to the other drill downs. We should discuss bringing the link to a job level report, and then drilling to the unit level.
    i. Below is a sample format

Category	Unit	Error/Warning	Description	Totals	12345678 - Dallas, TX	12345679 - Omaha, NE	etc.
	Container		**Total Containers**	**8,000**	**5,000**	**3,000**	
	Container		**Total Erros**	**61**	**34**	**27**	
	Container		**Percent**	**0.8%**	**0.7%**	**0.9%**	
	HU		**Total Handling Units**	**200,000**	**125,000**	**75,000**	
	HU		**Total Errors**	**148**	**68**	**80**	
	HU		**Percent**	**0.1%**	**0.1%**	**0.1%**	
	Piece		**Total Pieces**	**1,750,000**	**1,000,000**	**750,000**	
	Piece		**Total Errors**	**3,300**	**2,300**	**1,000**	
	Piece		**Percent**	**0.2%**	**0.2%**	**0.1%**	
Total Warnings	**All**			**6,025**	**5,000**	**1,025**	
Appointment Error	Container	E	Invalid Appt	**34**	20	14	
	Container	E	Appt ID NULL for Dropship	**5**		5	
	Container	E	FAST Irreg (non-damaged mail)				
	Container	E	eDoc EP and Appt Fac Mismatch				
	Container	E	FAST Damaged Mail Irreg				
	Container	E	eDoc Appt and Scan Appt Mismatch	**14**	14		
	Container	E	No Valid FAST Redirect				
	Container	E	Out of Date FAST Redirect				
	Container	E	Unknown eDoc EP Fac (lcle key)	**8**		8	
	Container	E	Unknown eDoc EP Fac (pstl code)				
CSA Errors	Container	E	Invalid CSA ID/Template Type				
	Container	E	NULL CSA ID for DMU-P				
	Container	E	CSA Not Active				
	Container	E	CSA Mail Class Mismatch				
			etc.				
Start The Clock	**Container**		**Total Containers**	**8,000**	**5,000**	**3,000**	
	Container		Total Start the Clock	**7,789**	**4,899**	**2,890**	
	Container		**Percent**	**97.4%**	**98.0%**	**96.3%**	
Start The Clock	**HU**		**Total Handling Units**	**200,000**	**125,000**	**75,000**	
	HU		Total Start the Clock	**198,900**	**124,000**	**74,900**	
	HU		**Percent**	**99.5%**	**99.2%**	**99.9%**	
Start The Clock	**Piece**		**Total Pieces**	**1,750,000**	**1,000,000**	**750,000**	
	Piece		Total Start the Clock	**1,739,998**	**999,998**	**740,000**	
	Piece		**Percent**	**99.4%**	**100.0%**	**98.7%**	

2. Mailing Data Quality Summary Report – Drill 1

   a. If the user clicks on a CRID/City/Sate field, all errors and warnings will display in a list of all errors for that CRID similar to the SASP Error Verification Report.

   b. If the user clicks on one of the errors, all of the same errors for all CRIDs will display in a list similar to the SASP Error Verification Report

Report Filter:
({Error Type} = Appointment Verification, ByFor Verification, CSA Verification, Default Tray Barcode, Delivery Point Verification, Entry Facility Verification, Mailer ID Verification, Service Performance Verification, Service Type Identifier Verification, Unique Container Barcode Verification, Unique Handling Unit Barcode Verification, Unique Piece Barcode Verification) And (Date (ID) Between 2/11/2012 and 2/17/2012) And (ApplyComparison("#0 in (select CRID from PR_MSTR_SECURITY_CRID_ALL_V where upper(MS_USER_NAME) = #1)",{Mail Preparer CRID} (CRID_NUMERIC),Upper("MQR_krejciks")) Or (ApplyComparison("#0 in (select CRID from PR_MSTR_SECURITY_CRID_ALL_V where upper(MS_USER_NAME) = #1)",{Mail Owner CRID} (CRID_NUMERIC),Upper("MQR_krejciks")) And Not(({MLOCR Indicator} (ID) = "Y") And ({Error Level} = C, H))))

Mail Preparer / Location	Job Mailing Date	Mailing Group ID	Customer Group ID	Job ID	User License Code	Submission Type	Error Type	Total Errors	Total Warnings
3236835 - PB PRESORT SERVICES INC - DFW (75050-1140)	2/17/2012	104760526		PDFW4633	PDFW	MAIL_DAT	Unique Handling Unit Barcode Verification	1	0
3236835 - PB PRESORT SERVICES INC - DFW (75050-1140)	2/17/2012	104760877		PDFW4635	PDFW	MAIL_DAT	Mailer ID Verification	1	0
3236835 - PB PRESORT SERVICES INC - DFW (75050-1140)	2/17/2012	104760526		PDFW4633	PDFW	MAIL_DAT	Unique Piece Barcode Verification	0	22
3236835 - PB PRESORT SERVICES INC - DFW (75050-1140)	2/17/2012	104760541		PDFW4634	PDFW	MAIL_DAT	Unique Piece Barcode Verification	0	127
3236835 - PB PRESORT SERVICES INC - DFW (75050-1140)	2/17/2012	104760541		PDFW4634	PDFW	MAIL_DAT	Default Tray Barcode	0	45
3236835 - PB PRESORT SERVICES INC - DFW (75050-1140)	2/17/2012	104760877		PDFW4635	PDFW	MAIL_DAT	Unique Handling Unit Barcode Verification	0	1
3236835 - PB PRESORT SERVICES INC - DFW (75050-1140)	2/17/2012	104760877		PDFW4635	PDFW	MAIL_DAT	Unique Piece Barcode Verification	0	46
3236835 - PB PRESORT SERVICES INC - DFW (75050-1140)	2/17/2012	104760877		PDFW4635	PDFW	MAIL_DAT	Default Tray Barcode	0	13
3236835 - PB PRESORT SERVICES INC - DFW (75050-1140)	2/16/2012	104710718		PDFW4627	PDFW	MAIL_DAT	Unique Piece Barcode Verification	0	127
3236835 - PB PRESORT SERVICES INC - DFW (75050-1140)	2/16/2012	104710718		PDFW4627	PDFW	MAIL_DAT	Delivery Point Verification	0	2
3236835 - PB PRESORT SERVICES INC - DFW (75050-1140)	2/16/2012	104710903		PDFW4628	PDFW	MAIL_DAT	Unique Piece Barcode Verification	0	6,122
3236835 - PB PRESORT SERVICES INC - DFW (75050-1140)	2/16/2012	104710903		PDFW4628	PDFW	MAIL_DAT	Default Tray Barcode	0	43
3236835 - PB PRESORT SERVICES INC - DFW (75050-1140)	2/16/2012	104711096		PDFW4629	PDFW	MAIL_DAT	Unique Piece Barcode Verification	0	2,875
3236835 - PB PRESORT SERVICES INC - DFW (75050-1140)	2/16/2012	104711096		PDFW4629	PDFW	MAIL_DAT	Delivery Point Verification	0	7
3236835 - PB PRESORT SERVICES INC - DFW (75050-1140)	2/16/2012	104711096		PDFW4629	PDFW	MAIL_DAT	Default Tray Barcode	0	10
3236835 - PB PRESORT SERVICES INC - DFW (75050-1140)	2/15/2012	104665714		PDFW4620	PDFW	MAIL_DAT	Unique Piece Barcode Verification	0	273
3236835 - PB PRESORT SERVICES INC - DFW (75050-1140)	2/15/2012	104665714		PDFW4620	PDFW	MAIL_DAT	Delivery Point Verification	0	2
3236835 - PB PRESORT SERVICES INC - DFW (75050-1140)	2/15/2012	104665714		PDFW4620	PDFW	MAIL_DAT	Default Tray Barcode	0	1
3236835 - PB PRESORT SERVICES INC - DFW (75050-1140)	2/15/2012	104665905		PDFW4621	PDFW	MAIL_DAT	Unique Piece Barcode Verification	0	6,989
3236835 - PB PRESORT SERVICES INC - DFW (75050-1140)	2/15/2012	104665905		PDFW4621	PDFW	MAIL_DAT	Default Tray Barcode	0	42
3236835 - PB PRESORT SERVICES INC - DFW (75050-1140)	2/15/2012	104666107		PDFW4622	PDFW	MAIL_DAT	Unique Piece Barcode Verification	0	3,313
3236835 - PB PRESORT SERVICES INC - DFW (75050-1140)	2/15/2012	104666107		PDFW4622	PDFW	MAIL_DAT	Delivery Point Verification	0	69
3236835 - PB PRESORT SERVICES INC - DFW (75050-1140)	2/15/2012	104666107		PDFW4622	PDFW	MAIL_DAT	Default Tray Barcode	0	16
3236835 - PB PRESORT SERVICES INC - DFW (75050-1140)	2/14/2012	104617957		PDFW4614	PDFW	MAIL_DAT	Unique Handling Unit Barcode Verification	0	2
3236835 - PB PRESORT SERVICES INC - DFW (75050-1140)	2/14/2012	104617957		PDFW4614	PDFW	MAIL_DAT	Unique Piece Barcode Verification	0	219

3. Mailing Data Quality Summary Report – Drill 2

   a. If the user clicks on an error, a detailed list displays providing container, HU or piece detail.

   b. Do not display mail owner information for trays or handling units for commingled mailings.

   c. Include the CSM container ID for handling units.

   d. For duplicates, also include the duplicate job id. Today this report only shows the group id.

   e. For certain types of errors, it would be beneficial if an image of the piece could be presented as another drill drown.

Error Mailing Date	Mailer ID	Mail Class	Mailing Group ID	Customer	Job ID	User Licens	Type	Lower	Upper	Affected	IM Barcode	Container ID	Piece ID	Container Type	CSA ID	Appointment ID	Error / Warning	Error Code	Error Description	Error Data	Additional Information
2/17/2012		First Class	104760526		PDFW4633	PDFW	HANDLING UNIT				7620524210005541828585 31			2 Foot Tray		24526R0217	Error	7604	The same Tray Barcode (IMtb) from the eDoc (.csm or QualReport) was used more than once within 45 days from the Postage Statement Mailing Date, across Jobs with the same Mail Facility ID	DUPLICATE MAILING GROUP ID = 103862118	Click for additional information

Export:

It would be nice if the summary report could be exported or all unit level error detail for the selected report criteria. The exports in place today only export the data in the current displayed report. This would allow mailers to do separate internal analysis to monitor and improve mailing quality. The export should be through XML, or in an EXCEL file or text file.

Historic Quality Trend report:

This report would graph the overall quality percentage over a period of time using a rolling average. We will present ideas on this one in the next few weeks.