

MTAC Task Team # 10 Face-to-Face teleconference:

Automate Presort Certification and Encourage eDOC adoption Meeting Summary –

11/30/11 from 8:00 through 9:00 am CST

Invitees / Participants:

Name	Company	Email Address	Attended
Cher Rupp-Ruggeri	USPS	Rupp-Ruggeri, Cher - Washington, DC	✓
Braden McCollum	SAP	braden.mccollum@sap.com	✓
* Brad Hill			✓
* Del Estrada	Experian	Del.Estrada@Experian.com	✓
* Noel Wickham	Experian	Noel.Wickham@Experian.com	✓
* Richard Navarro	Melissa Data	Richard@Melissadata.com	✓
* Todd Brabender	Flagship Software Ltd.	tbrabender@flagshipsoftware.com	
* Uni Han-Norton	USPS	Han-Norton, Uni K - Washington, DC	✓
Amy Stanley	Syntel	amy@syntellc.com, astanley@syntellc.com	✓
Anthony Aruldoss	Anchor	aaruldoss@anchorcomputersoftware.com	✓
Beth A Bigelow	USPS-Accenture	Bigelow, Beth A - Washington, DC - Contractor	✓
Bill Garber	Interlink	Bill@ILSW.COM	
Bob Gallagher			
Bob Johnson	Pitney Bowes, Inc	bob.johnson@pb.com	✓
Bob Schimek	BCC Software	bobs@bccsoftware.com	✓
Brian Gartner	Satori	bgartner@satorissoftware.com	✓
David Lindquist	Experian	dave.lindquist@experian.com	
David Propst	Pitney Bowes Business Insight	David.Propst@pb.com	✓
David Robinson	Pitney Bowes, Inc.	david.robinson@pb.com	✓
Dawn Blackburn	Micro Systems Specialists, Inc	msssoftware@cs.com	
Dewitt Crawford	USPS NCSC	Crawford, Dewitt - Memphis, TN - Contractor	✓
Donna L Cody	USPS	Cody, Donna L - Reno, NV	
Ed Hardin	Hardin-Soft Inc	ehardin@hardin-soft.com	
Edward F Wanta	USPS NCSC	Wanta, Edward F - Memphis, TN	
James A Cutter	USPS NCSC BMA	Cutter, James A - Memphis, TN - Contractor	✓
Jerry McCarthy	Quintessential Mailing Software Inc (QMSI)	jerry@cpmg.com	
Jim Garber	Interlink	james.jei@covad.net	✓
Jim Halferty	Publishers Information Center	jhalferty@egpp.com	
Joe Bailey	Monticello / Magellan	joe@montsoft.com, monticellojoebailey@hotmail.com	✓
John Wittington	Time Customer Service	john.wittington@custserv.com	✓

MTAC Task Team # 10 Face-to-Face teleconference:

Automate Presort Certification and Encourage eDOC adoption Meeting Summary –

11/30/11 from 8:00 through 9:00 am CST

Name	Company	Email Address	Attended
Judy Kalus		judy.kalus@pd.com	
Kenneth Penland			
Kevin Ricks	Pitney Bowes Business Insight	kevin.ricks@pb.com	✓
Kim Mauch	Satori Software	kmauch@satorissoftware.com	✓
Kristi Kanitz	Flagship	kristi@flagshipsoftware.com	
Leah D Mire	USPS NCSC BMA	Mire, Leah D - Memphis, TN - Contractor	
Lue Harris	USPS NCSC BMA	Harris, Lue - Memphis, TN - Contractor	✓
Mark Lemke	SAP	mark.lemke@sap.com	
Mike Gibson	Satori Software	mgibson@satorissoftware.com	
Philip Robinson	P.E.R. Software	phil@persoftware.com	
Ralph Pelayo	MyPostageRateSaver (DBA)	ralphpelayo@gmail.com	
Scott Hochberg	L. Scott Hochberg Consulting	scott@savepostage.com	✓
Stephanie Hartzberg	Accenture	stephanie.hartzberg@accenture.com	
Steve Belmonte	ACCUZIP	steve@accuzip.com	
Susan Thomas	USPS	Thomas, Susan J - Washington, DC	✓
Terry Lawhon	Datatech Smartsoft	tlawhon@snowcrest.net	
Todd Black	Time Customer Service	Todd_Black@timeinc.com	✓
Tom Nastek	Bell & Howell BCC	tomn@bccsoftware.com	✓
Tom Truong	Melissa Data	tom@melissadata.com	
Wallace Vingelis	WindowBook	wvingelis@windowbook.com	✓
William "Bryan" Towery	USPS NCSC BMA	Towery, William - Memphis, TN - Contractor	✓

Discussion Points:

1. Roll Call and Individual Introductions =
Cher led the group in a roll call for those participating in person at the Face-to-Face conference location as well as through the MeetingPlace web conference interface.
 * = New participants
2. MTAC Task Team # 10 Face-to-Face Inputs =
Cher shared the majority of the inputs indicated that PAVE was necessary so the group would go forward with how to make it streamlined and workable electronically. She shared the submission to questions presented for the Face-to-Face meeting and led the group in idea discussion/brainstorming.

MTAC Task Team # 10 Face-to-Face teleconference:

Automate Presort Certification and Encourage eDOC adoption Meeting Summary –

11/30/11 from 8:00 through 9:00 am CST



MTACtt10--Face2Fac
e PDF

Figure 1 -- MTAC Task Team # 10 Inputs

- a. Defining Electronic Submission – The group brought up methods for providing PAVE or PostalOne! data to NCSC =
- Compact Disc (CD)
 - Mail.dat or Mail.XML through PostalOne!

Consensus → Sending Mail.dat or Mail.XML through PostalOne! seems the quickest and least developer-intensive method to handle electronic submission as part of the Task Team instructions/mandate. Those file formats do or will accommodate specific data necessary within current PAVE Certification processing despite known and potential challenges with the PostalOne! (Business Customer Gateway) system

- b. Small-scale Mailer, Simplified Certification Recommendation -- **An unidentified male participant** shared his thoughts about having a combined or an integrated PAVE and PostalOne! Certification.

The PAVE Certification would be for small-scale (between **one** and **5,000 mailpiece** manifest mailing) Mailers that would have to submit/produce single-transaction/single-scenario Mail.dat or Mail.XML formatted:

- USPS Qualification Reports
- Postage Statements
- Co-Bundled Container Report
- Entire [PostalOne!] ready-to-pay job

The PostalOne! Certification would be simplified or even satisfied through the completed PAVE Certification within the system's environment (e.g., TEM, CAT, a modified Production, etc.)

The main thought in favor of this approach (PRO) hinged on the assurance of USPS with having quality, PAVE certified manifest mailings within the PostalOne! system. The primary thought opposed (CON) centered on the possibility that Mailers may have to undergo PAVE Certification with each manifest mailing, wasting time and resources coupled with the specter of still not being able to get their mailings past Postmasters into the mail stream.

Consensus → By adopting this recommendation, this could become an additional Certification Level (i.e., Platinum, Silver, etc.); however, it required more discussion with specifics

MTAC Task Team # 10 Face-to-Face teleconference:

Automate Presort Certification and Encourage eDOC adoption Meeting Summary –

11/30/11 from 8:00 through 9:00 am CST

- c. Establishing a PAVE Grading/Testing Module within the PostalOne! Database/System – **An unidentified female participant** offered and the group discussed the probability of getting the PAVE Grading/Testing routines/Engine retooled and working within the PostalOne! Database/System.

With the pending release of Mail.dat/Mail.XML version 12.2, the Labeling List Identified Usage Dates would no longer pose a problem for the PAVE Team as they would have this information visible within that version's files for specific manifest mailings. The main identified PRO expressed a positive that handling PAVE Certification in the same or next level certification environment currently used with Mail.dat, etc. manifest mailing processing. The main identified CON rested on not having a set, predetermined, known Answer Key/Set to effectively determine quickly/consistently if the PAVE Certification successfully completed.

Although Cher reminded the group that at this stage of discussion that the platform, environment, or processing should not be a factor, the group countered that use of existing file formats and systems seemed the most efficient, logical, and forthright progression to achieve the Task Team's goals to help reduce or eliminate paper submissions for certifications and mailings.

Consensus → A potential solution, requiring further discussion with specifics

- e. Disposition of PAVE Certification Levels – Amy asked and the group discussed retaining the Gold and Standard PAVE Certification Levels with the proposed changes.
- *Interim PAVE Gold Certification and Hardcopy Review methods* -- the group offered and discussed ideas on how this level could continue although the processing may be entirely through electronic means, gearing the outputs to remain consistent with those currently set (i.e., Qualification Reports, Postage Statements, etc.). Someone in the group offered that the PAVE Team could review hardcopy materials in PDFs instead of through large quantities of paper.

Consensus → Retain current and possibly expand levels to reflect newer guidelines. Requires further discussion with details

- f. Identified PAVE Certification challenges – The group mentioned items that included =
- *Current versus Proposed File formats (UFF versus Mail.dat/Mail.XML)* -- for Mailers: complexity of transferring to and using new formats; for Developers: coding with little anticipated ROI, specifically for the effort expended; and, USPS: ensuring all data elements for PAVE Certification reside within the newer formats or capability for extraction from newer formats for conversion to UFF all without a need to "reinvent the wheel"
 - *Mail.dat/Mail.XML Frequent changes* -- the potential exists that use of these file formats require Developers to perform multiple coding/programming changes to ensure the format's changes provide the correct manifest mailing data. The same potential challenge exists for PAVE Certification and Grading Programs

MTAC Task Team # 10 Face-to-Face teleconference:

Automate Presort Certification and Encourage eDOC adoption Meeting Summary –

11/30/11 from 8:00 through 9:00 am CST

- *Difference in use of Mail.XML versus XML formatting -- The group shared that output of Postage Statement data into XML formats pose little challenge while doing the same for Mail.XML requires quite a bit more effort. Many expressed reservation in attempting to do so for PAVE Certification purposes.*
- *Performing Real-time Testing or Seamless Acceptance Seamless Processing (SASP) in the PostalOne! System for PAVE Certification -- **An unidentified male participant** offered his thoughts that these discussions seemed reminiscent of SASP methodologies. If this direction proved true, the PAVE Certification portion should conform to providing some sort of dynamic, formulaic ranking of software while undergoing certification or mailings. PRO = could show effectiveness of Developers' software to get certified manifest mailings successfully in the mail stream while CON = may provide false metrics that realistically show Mailers' effectiveness in using a Developers' software for those purposes*

Cher and Beth offered that closer examination of existing PAVE Certification program processes in the near term could help with determining how close it and SASP methodologies match, yielding another potential avenue to provide Task Team recommendations.

Consensus → *After receiving the PAVE Certification program process results, the group plans to explore and provide detailed recommendations for effecting an all-electronic certification version*

g. **Defining Street Cred** – *Cher gave examples of some training/certification offerings that held value to participants as well as the USPS. Based on those examples, the group attempted to provide a definition; however the main focus resulted in methods for alleviating the following existing conditions =*

- *PAVE Certified software outputs not receiving the consideration consistent with the successfully passed tests/certification status*
- *USPS personnel (Postmasters) who seem to refuse to work with Mailers and their mailings despite receiving confirmation of PAVE Certified software that generated the mailings, leaving both mailer and mailing sitting on the docks*
- *Blame assessed to Developers by Postmasters or Mailers although their software attained PAVE Certification and mailings do not make it into the mail stream or there remains a lack of communication/coordination to resolve issues*

Consensus → **Street Cred** *requires detailed definition and the full support of USPS at every level!*

MTAC Task Team # 10 Face-to-Face teleconference:

Automate Presort Certification and Encourage eDOC adoption Meeting Summary –

11/30/11 from 8:00 through 9:00 am CST

3. **Question** and **Answer** =

Are Firms [records/data introduced] **in[to]** **automation** [scenarios, schemes, files, etc.]?

No.

Next Steps:

- Visit NCSC Memphis, TN for PAVE Program Insight =
Cher and Stephanie plan to visit NCSC Memphis, TN and review the PAVE Program in detail during the week of December 5, reporting their findings by the next scheduled meeting
- Scheduled MTAC Task Team # 10 Meeting =
Friday, December 9 at 1:00 pm Eastern