

Enhancement Request

Mailers' Technical Advisory Committee Workgroup # 121

Revision: Final

2/8/2009

The following document contains the enhancement requests resulting from discussions from MTAC Workgroup #121.

This document is intended to provide a high level description of the enhancement requests along with supporting information for the need, the perceived benefits, and potential implementation details. The recommended next step is for the appropriate departments within the USPS to review these requests to determine which of the following actions will occur, and provide that information back to the Workgroup and MTAC leadership:

- **Take Action Now:** in this case, the Workgroup members requests that the USPS hold specific discussions to:
 - completely define the issue
 - determine how to and properly measure the magnitude and root causes of the issue
 - analyze the potential solutions, factoring in costs, benefits, timelines and risks to all parties involved (USPS, Mailers, Mail Preparers, Vendors)
 - implement the agreed upon solutions
 - confirm that the solutions implemented had the desired impact and as appropriate, establish processes to ensure that the issues do not reoccur over time.
- **Take No Action:** the Workgroup members request documentation of the reasons why no actions will be taken specific to the request
- **Take No Action Now (future issue):** the Workgroup members request documentation of the reasons why no actions will be taken at this time and what factors are influencing this decision – i.e. what factors will influence the decision of when action may be be justified to have action taken in the future.

While many specific, worthwhile development and implementation activities have been identified, some are expected to be identified for future action. Unless funded and effectively implemented by the Postal Service and mailing industry, the promise and benefits of this Workgroup's effort will remain unfulfilled. Therefore, MTAC Workgroup 121 requests that the MTAC Leadership establish a formal process to record, track, and follow-up on the recommendations and request made by this and other MTAC workgroups. A separate recommendation on how this may be accomplished was generated and submitted to the MTAC Leadership.

MTAC Work Group 121 Enhancement Requests

In addition to documenting the request, this document conveys the industry's perception of the priority of these issues (as determined by an independent ranking from Workgroup 121 participants). These Enhancement Requests are listed in order of priority (high to low) as determined by participants of MTAC Workgroup 121.

Additionally, participants of MTAC Workgroup 121 have provided their input as to the categorization and impact of these items. That information is provided as part of each request.

While the requests all have some level of connection to ACS™ and mailers ability to maximize the use and benefit of ACS services, the requests do not all fall within the sole scope of the USPS's ACS department. The following table lists the request as prioritized by the Workgroup. NOTE: in some cases, the priority or even the need for an enhancement can change with the implementation of other requests. The table also indicates the Workgroup's understanding of whether the next step of evaluating the request falls within the scope of the ACS department or some other USPS department:

	Request	Scope	
		ACS	Other
1	Consistency needed in ACS NIXIE notices		X
2	ACS™ Data Transmission PostalOne! vs. RIBBS and/or via FTP sites	X	
3	Make TANs optional or add data	X	
4	OneCode ACS support of Keyline		X
5	Support Only Free ACS Notices		X
6	Provide Secure Destruction of UAA First-Class Mail		X
7	Ability to direct ACS™ Fees vs. Data with supporting data	X	
8	Add Return Service Requested (RSR) support to ACS	X	
9	Add time factor to assessing different levels of ACS fees		X
10	Provide original name and address data for nixie notices		X
11	Move Update: correction of invalid moves		X
12	Future CAPS Capabilities	X	
13	COA records will not DPV confirm	X	
14	Communication for New or Updated USPS® Services	X	
15	Support 8pt font on Endorsements		X
16	Program location for Physical Return Mail and Notices	X	
17	*Mailer ID Inquiry Support		X
18	Update Published Terminology between USPS publications		X
19	Stop marking over address on Physical Returns		X
20	Support Reverse Print of Endorsements		X

* NOTE: after the generation of this request, it was brought to the attention of the Workgroup that efforts are underway to support this capability within PostalOne!. A review of this request should occur ASAP to ensure that the effort underway meets the needs identified by this Workgroup.

Enhancement Request

Mailers' Technical Advisory Committee Workgroup # 121

Internal Workgroup Issues: 13

The One Category describing how this applies to ACS and Usage of ACS			All Categories That Apply				
Barrier	Hindrance	Enhancement	Cost	Performance /Quality	Timeliness /Schedule	Communi-ication	Inno-vation
43%	29%	29%	30%	50%	0%	20%	0%

1. Consistency needed in ACS NIXIE notices

The NIXIE notices are all carrier identified and continue to be considered unreliable and non-actionable by many mailers. Efforts are needed to understand and address this situation.

1.1. Business / Market Case

Studies for pre PARS showed that there were issues with the consistency and accuracy of NIXIE notices. In a majority of cases, repeated mailings to the same address that generated a first NIXIE notice would not generate a second notice. And even fewer that generated second notices would generate a third notice.

Of the participants of MTAC 121, none commented that they act on the first occurrence of a NIXIE Notice.

One mailer commented that they act on the second occurrence and that they are currently seeing that only about 50% of the first notices result in a second notice. This mailer is attempting to obtain a more detailed analysis of what they are currently receiving.

Another mailer commented that they wait until the third notice to take any action, and that they rarely receive a third notice. But they did not have current statistical information.

However, there is a need for a more detailed analysis as the comments above most likely reflect a more severe issue than actually exists. First, some mailers consider the Temporary Away notices to be NIXIE notices when they are actually Deliverability Codes. Temporary Away notices should stop being produced – as soon as the Temporary order has expired. Additionally, there are multiple NIXIE notices that are also reasonable or even expected to change or stop over time. These include:

- E In dispute – eventually, the dispute should get settled
- L Illegible – potentially due to a one time production issue
- M No mail receptacle – temporarily damaged, or may change with new residents
- V Vacant – until someone moves in

Therefore, to properly measure the true severity of this issue, a more detailed analysis of current ACS NIXIE notices is required.

MTAC Work Group 121 Enhancement Requests

Above we refer to the issue of getting the same NIXIE notice across subsequent mailings to the same address. An additional issue has to do with the consistency of getting the same ACS NIXIE notice across mailings. For example, the first NIXIE notice may be “I Insufficient” but the second notice may be returned as “B Returned for better address”, “N No such number”, or “S No such Street”.

The analysis would need to focus on the NIXIE notices that should be stable (i.e. not change over time and occur on every mailing). The Key data points to be measured are:

- counts for each type of NIXIE notice
- counts for repeated mailings that did and did not result in second and third notices with the same NIXIE code
 - also counts for those that resulted in additional NIXIE notices with different codes

However, multiple mailers commented that the analysis efforts performed several years ago did not result in corrective actions. Therefore, before engaging in a current data analysis, the mailing industry would like some assurance that the USPS and especially the appropriate departments of the USPS are committed to the data gathering, analysis, and implementation of justified recommendations.

The results would be pretty straight forward. More mailers would utilize the NIXIE notices to impact future mailings and/or reduce the number of NIXIE notice repeats required before taking action. This will result in less UAA mail in future mailings.

1.1.1. Mailer

By being able to utilize NIXIE information to impact future mailings, mailers will increase the value of the future mailings by reducing the number of UAA mail pieces.

1.1.2. USPS

By having more mailers acting on NIXIE notices to either resolve or suppress the addresses, the amount of UAA mail that the USPS needs to process will be reduced. This will have a very positive impact on the USPS finances and mailers can easily ensure that all NIXIE notices are either Free or at the minimum fee (neither of which covers the USPS costs for processing, handling, and reporting these NIXIE records).

1.2. Current Products / Processes Impacted

Any changes are dependent on the participation of the delivery unit personnel that provide it. All ACS NIXIE notices result from Delivery Unit employee identification. Therefore, any variations are the result of differences in identification and handling. These variations could be due to different handling by a single employee or differences in handling between multiple employees.

1.3. Feature Design Details

Analysis of the current NIXIE notices is required to be able to determine the root causes of the issues and any resulting corrective actions. But, any changes are expected to begin with the education and training of the Carriers. Therefore, the appropriate departments of the USPS must be included in all analysis efforts associated with this topic.

1.3.1. Feature Input

There may need to be additional documentation and training to ensure proper and consistent handling of UAA mail (and the generation of ACS NIXIE notices).

1.3.2. Feature Processing

It all starts with the delivery units and their identification of the reasons for the UAA mail. The key is to ensure consistent processing both by an individual employee and between multiple employees.

1.3.3. Feature Output

No changes to the actual layout of the data (i.e. the NIXIE notices). The difference will be in the level of reliability in the NIXIE notices.

1.4. Support of multiple groups

Before the mailing industry will commit to another analysis of the NIXIE notices, some assurances are required to indicate that the results of the analysis will result in corrective actions. As the key component of the corrective actions will be the delivery personnel, the assurances need to come from the USPS and specifically the appropriate departments of the USPS.

Enhancement Request

Mailers' Technical Advisory Committee Workgroup # 121

Internal Workgroup Issue: 17

The One Category describing how this applies to ACS and Usage of ACS			All Categories That Apply				
Barrier	Hindrance	Enhancement	Cost	Performance /Quality	Timeliness /Schedule	Communication	Innovation
29%	57%	14%	29%	18%	29%	18%	6%

2. ACS™ Data Transmission PostalOne! vs. RIBBS and/or via FTP sites

Basic, OneCode ACS™ and Traditional ACS™ currently requires mailers to use RIBBS to download files for address correction notifications. Mailers request to obtain ACS™ information through PostalONE! as an alternative to the RIBBS website. Alternatively, mailers request the USPS® develop a process to push data to a mailer specified secure FTP site where the data recipient could complete edit checks and automate the ingestion of ACS data from the USPS.

2.1. Business / Market Case

The RIBBS process to obtain the ACS™ downloads is often cumbersome, requiring .zip file downloads, and in its current state is not easily automated. To that end, some companies do not allow .zip file downloads from the web due to information security protocol.

2.1.1. Mailers

Through easier access to data, mailers will more readily be able to update their addresses. Automation also reduces the ongoing operating costs by eliminating manual processes and potential errors resulting from the use of manual processes.

2.1.2. USPS

Ease of using the ACS™ program may encourage more mailers to participate in ACS™. Greater participation in ACS™ will reduce processing costs for the USPS®, work towards reducing the overall costs associated with UAA mail, and reduce the amount of future UAA mail.

2.2. Current Products / Processes Impacted

Currently mailers access ACS™ information via RIBBS. It is the industries' understanding that PostalONE! has the capability to provide information back to mailers and/or is being developed as part of development for the support of the Full Service IMb

implementation. The request is to expand support of this data delivery mechanism to all ACS users.

2.3. Feature Design Details

There are potentially a wide variety of types of automated data transfer (data push) that may be desired by the industry. Supporting all requests would not be practical. Technical discussions should be held with both current ACS users and potential ACS users to determine the methods for the pushing of ACS data that is the most desired by the Mailing Industry.

2.3.1. Feature Input

Mailers would need a method to request the push of ACS data, supply the information needed to configure the push of the data, and methods to test that the push of the data process is working prior to use in production.

IMPORTANT NOTE: When a solution involves a non-USPS system to have a connection to a postal system, the non-USPS system falls under the security requirements of the USPS. Mailers need to be aware that system receiving data pushes may require additional security upgrades and protocols to meet USPS security requirements.

2.3.2. Feature Processing

The ACS data would be pushed daily to the recipient using the configuration information provided.

The system would also need to support notification to the recipient when a problem occurred with the push of the data.

2.3.3. Feature Output

ACS information is received via the push of data in accordance with the format requested. The data includes a method for the validation of the data that has been received.

Enhancement Request

Mailers' Technical Advisory Committee Workgroup # 121

Internal Workgroup Issues: 32, 45

The One Category describing how this applies to ACS and Usage of ACS			All Categories That Apply				
Barrier	Hindrance	Enhancement	Cost	Performance /Quality	Timeliness /Schedule	Communi- cation	Inno- vation
14%	71%	14%	33%	33%	8%	25%	0%

3. Make Temporarily Away Notices (TANs) optional or add data

Implement a new ACS option that allows for the suppression of Temporary Away Notices (TAN) or include additional information with the Temporary Away Notices to increase the value of the notices.

3.1. Business / Market Case

The current TANs provide only a flag that a TAN exists. The new address is neither provided, nor any additional information included indicating the duration of the TAN (i.e. neither the start nor end date).

Mailers have reported that in some cases the TANs represent as much as 20% of the ACS notices received. However, because of their mailing requirements and/or the lack of any other additional information (temporary address or end date), there is no action that they are able to take regarding this information – and therefore these notices result in ACS fees and processing costs while providing no value to the mailers.

Of course, there are also mailers for which receiving the TAN information does have value and does result in positive actions. To accommodate both industry needs, the current ACS handling of TANs should be reviewed to either eliminate costs and/or increase value.

Option 1: Eliminate Cost

By allowing mailers to choose not to receive TANs, the USPS can reduce some processing costs while the mailers avoid costs for receiving and processing information that has no value. This will increase the value of using ACS and allow for a better ROI.

Option 2: Increase Value

Another option is to provide more information with the Temporary away ACS records such that more mailers are able to take action with the data. There are three (3) pieces of information that could be considered to be added:

- New Temporary Address – minimal value without one of the following items
- TAN Expiration date – or an indicator of some sort (i.e. <30 days, > 30 days)

TAN Start date – again, minimal value (mailers must guesstimate an end date)
By far, the most valuable piece of information is having some kind of indicator as to the Expiration of the TAN.

NOTE: these two options are not mutually exclusive. Both options should be considered and evaluated on their own merits.

3.1.1. Mailers

Option 1:

Mailers would not need to receive, process, and pay for TAN notices for which they are not able to take any action (i.e. receive any benefit). For these mailers, not having to account for the TAN notices will make it easier to cost justify the implementation and usage of ACS.

Option 2:

Mailers receive additional data that allows them to take action on the notices. In other words, the notice have a positive value.

3.1.2. Mailer Service Providers

This issue represents a burden to Mailer Service Providers as well.

Some Mailers use Service Providers to process the ACS notices. For Mailers that are not able to use the current TANs, some will not have an ROI that supports the utilization of ACS (so the Service Provider does not get the business).

For those mailers that do justify the use of ACS but can not make use of the TANs, the Service Providers are the ones that still incur the burden of receiving and filtering out these notices.

3.1.3. USPS

The TANs also reflect a processing burden to the USPS for which the USPS may be seeing no positive benefits.

Especially with the new pricing models proposed for Full Service IMb implementations, it is suspected that a majority of the TANs the USPS generates with OneCode ACS will be Free or at the lower notice fees (notice 1 or 2).

If mailers are simply discarding these notices, the USPS incurred the costs and the USPS systems were burdened with having to handle these notices.

Option 1:

Suppressing the TANs reduces the processing efforts (costs) of the USPS and the burden on the USPS systems.

Option 2:

If additional data is provided that allows the mailers to take actions on the TANs, the USPS will benefit as well from a reduction in UAA mail. Mailers can direct the mail to the new, temporary address – so the USPS does not need to forward. And/or, mailers can suppress mail – so the USPS does not incur the costs of continually processing UAA mail pieces.

3.1.4. Environment

Any efforts that result in reductions of the volume of UAA mail benefits the Environment.

3.2. Current Products / Processes Impacted

The ACS configuration / registration process would need to change. PARS and CFS Site operations would also need to be change. There may also need to be additional service type codes and/or endorsements.

3.3. Feature Design Details

The USPS and Mailing Industry would need to discuss the implementation details – evaluating both the costs and benefits of various options. There are also legal concerns and potential ramifications of providing additional information with the TANs that will need to be vetted.

3.3.1. Feature Input

Option 1:

When registering for ACS services, mailers would need to be able to indicate their desire for receiving or suppressing TANs.

3.3.2. Feature Processing

Option 1:

Both PARS and CFS Site operations would need access to the Mailer's ACS configuration information to determine if TANs are to be generated. If the Mailer has elected to not receive the TANs, then no notice is generated and the physical piece is processed as usual.

3.3.3. Feature Output

Option 1:

Mailers electing to suppress the TANs do not receive any TANs or any associated fees.

Option 2:

The ACS notices already have locations identified for holding New Address information. In the case of a TAN, these locations would be used to hold the Temporary address information.

MTAC Work Group 121 Enhancement Requests

Additionally, the ACS notices already have a location for the Move Effective date (reflecting only the 2 digit month and 4 digit year). In the case of a TAN, this field could be utilized to indicate either the Start date or the End date for the TAN on file.

This same 6 character field could also be used to indicate both the Start date and an indicator of the End Date. The following table represents just one possible implementation that could be considered:

Digit	Value	Description
1	T	Indicates TAN information as opposed to regular COA Move Effective date information
2-3	Numeric	The 2 digit Year of the Start date
4-5	Numeric	The 2 digit Month of the End date
6	Numeric	The number of months over which the TAN is effective. For a typical TAN, this would be a value of 0-6. As an advanced capability, since TANs can be re-filed for an additional 6 months, if the USPS can link the TANs, then this field could be changed to an Alpha/Numeric with values of 0-9 for months zero through nine and A = 10 months, B=11 months, C = 12 months

Enhancement Request

Mailers' Technical Advisory Committee Workgroup # 121

Internal Workgroup Issue: 26

The One Category describing how this applies to ACS and Usage of ACS			All Categories That Apply				
Barrier	Hindrance	Enhancement	Cost	Performance /Quality	Timeliness /Schedule	Communi-ication	Inno-vation
14%	57%	29%	25%	38%	6%	19%	13%

4. OneCode ACS support of Keyline

Add support into OneCode ACS to read the printed Keyline data and provide in the ACS notices.

4.1. Business / Market Case

One of the hindrances limiting Mailers ability to utilize OneCode ACS and/or to transition from Traditional ACS to OneCode ACS is the replacement of the Keyline with the Sequence Number. In addition to supporting more characters of data, the Keyline supports not only Numeric characters but also Alpha and Alphanumeric character sets.

Mailers have used the additional data to facilitate several operations regarding the processing of the ACS Notices. For example, this can include identification of the originating list / list owner where the updates need to be applied.

The need for this additional data (over what can be done with just the Sequence Number) is such that support for the acceptance and return of Keyline data is being added to the Mailer supplied e-Documentation and PostalOne! Process (respectively). Essentially, the Keyline information will be added to the e-Documentation so that it can be returned in any resulting OneCode ACS notices. But, this only is a potential solution for mailers generating e-Documentation. This will also increase the size of the e-Documentation files by adding a lot of information that will never be used (since the majority of mail does not result in an ACS Notice. The expectation is that the Keyline data will be returned in the prior location in the ACS Notices (with the IMb still returned in the dedicated location.

By having the Keyline information read from the physical mailpiece, both the USPS and Mailers can utilize existing processes and procedures that do not further complicate the eDoc generation and submission.

4.1.1. Mailers

For mailers using Traditional ACS, the transition to OneCode ACS will be far easier. Keylines can continue to be generated using existing processes and the processing of notices using the Keyline data can remain with only minor modifications.

For mailers looking to implement OneCode ACS, the return of printed Keyline information will increase the value of the notifications and allow for more efficient processing. Mailers can use the Keyline to provide greater identification of the mail piece and what processing is to be done with the ACS Notices.

4.1.2. USPS

The need for Keyline data is a key factor impacting a mailers ability to convert to OneCode ACS, which, in turn, affects the value to mailers to implementing the IMb and especially the Full Service option.

4.2. Current Products / Processes Impacted

Both PARS and CFS Site processing would need to be updated.

4.3. Feature Design Details

Processing within PARS and CFS Sites already support the reading of printed Keyline information and the return of this information to be part of Traditional ACS Notices. The only change is to read and return this information for pieces using OneCode ACS as well.

4.3.1. Feature Input

In addition to OneCode ACS being used, mailers would print Keyline data on the mail pieces (but no participant code).

4.3.2. Feature Processing

PARS and CFS site processing would be changed to also return any Keyline data on the mailpiece as part of the OneCode ACS notices. The USPS systems would also need to support the storage of the provided Keyline information for inclusion in the generated ACS Notices.

4.3.3. Feature Output

The Keyline data would be provided in the OneCode ACS Notices is the same location as it currently appears in the Traditional ACS Notices:

Position: 17–32
Length: 16
Type: A/N

The Mailer ID / Participant Code field (position 10-16) would be blank.

The Mailer ID and Sequence number would appear in the IMb field at:

Position: 428–458
Length: 31
Type: N

Enhancement Request

Mailers' Technical Advisory Committee Workgroup # 121

Internal Workgroup Issue: 22

The One Category describing how this applies to ACS and Usage of ACS			All Categories That Apply				
Barrier	Hindrance	Enhancement	Cost	Performance /Quality	Timeliness /Schedule	Communication	Innovation
29%	29%	43%	55%	18%	0%	9%	18%

5. Support Only Free ACS Notices

Mailers and Mail Preparers want a method to ensure that only Free (electronic/automated) ACS notices are generated. There are changes being discussed in a subgroup of MTAC 122 that will give more control to mailers to ensure that only Free ACS Notices are generated.

However, even with those changes, they may not guarantee that only Free ACS notices are generated.

5.1. Business / Market Case

Mailer Service Providers who use names and address that are not their own can incur ACS costs (fees come to them instead of the mail owner). To avoid this scenario and others, mailers and mail preparers want a method to ensure that only Free ACS notices are generated. Since such a method exists for First-Class mail, this request is focused primarily on Standard Mail and Periodicals.

Part of the problem is that the current requirement forces an endorsement to be printed on Standard Mail pieces. Because of production cycles and processes, endorsements are often printed far in advance of the actual mailing – and the receipt and processing of UAA information from prior mailings. This makes it difficult for mailers to selectively activate and deactivate ACS.

It is our understanding that a Sub-group of MTAC 122 is working on this and related issues. Their proposed solutions should be reviewed when created.

There are too many unknowns in the ACS process. It starts with the variation in the time between a mailing and the generation of an ACS notice. Combined with the 30 day limit on free ACS notices (Full Service IMb implementation), it becomes difficult to predict potential fees.

5.1.1. Mail Preparer

Mail Preparers will be able to utilize ACS services without the risk of incurring fees that they would then need to try to collect from the mail owner. This will allow for more mail preparers to offer the ACS service to their clients.

5.1.2. Mail Owner

Mail owners will be able to utilize ACS services without the risk of unknown fees. This will allow for more data to be returned to mailers, more quickly, and in a format that can be more readily utilized to impact future mailings.

This will allow for a reduction in the generation of additional UAA mailings, increased customer contact and retention, and increasing the value of future mailings.

5.1.3. USPS

By allowing more mailers to utilize ACS services, future UAA mail volumes will be reduced, which reduces future handling costs.

The ability to use ACS, specifically OneCode ACS, and the proposed pricing for the use of OneCode ACS with a Full Service implementation of the Intelligent Mail barcode will both give mailers an incentive to make the migration and cost justify the Full Service implementation of the Intelligent Mail barcode. Increased use of the IMb and the Full Service implementation will reduce USPS processing costs.

5.1.4. Environment

Any efforts that result in reductions of the volume of UAA mail benefits the Environment.

5.2. Current Products / Processes Impacted

Solutions being discussed by MTAC 122 would include changes to the requirement for an endorsement on Standard Mail pieces using ACS, and potentially on Carrier handling procedures.

The preferred solution is simply to change the 30 day limit on Free ACS notices to a timeframe that takes into account typical production cycles and ACS notice generation variations.

5.3. Feature Design Details

A subgroup of MTAC 122 is working on the details of several potential solutions. The details from that sub-group should be considered when completed. Solutions being discussed include:

- Remove the printed endorsement requirement for Letters. PARS will use the Service Type code in the IMb to determine how the piece is to be processed.
- Modification of “Electronic Service Requested” and the creation of new Service Type Codes to restrict Manual returns.

In many of these scenarios, the USPS would incur the transportation cost of getting the pieces from the carrier back to PARS or CFS site and the resulting processing cost. This is only an issue when the Service Type code in the IMb indicates no action. In this case, the USPS incurred the costs with no benefit. Therefore, part of what 122 is considering is that printing of additional information in the address block that will provide a readable indicator to the mail carrier if an ACS related service code does indeed exist in the IMb.

Even with control being given to the Service Type code in the IMb, there are still issues due to the 30 limit on free ACS notices for Standard Mail. Because of ACS notification timelines (and variations in the timeline), mailers production cycles and cost containment procedures, it will be common for secondary mail pieces to be produced that will result in notices beyond the 30 day limit – thus resulting in unwanted and unpredictable fees. Even with having control over ACS in the IMB, this will prevent some mailers from being able to justify the use of ACS.

Therefore, this request is to create a process such that only Free ACS notices are provided.

Option 1:

The simple solution is to increase the 30 day limit on Free ACS notices to a time period that accommodates typical Standard Mail production cycles and the variations in ACS notice timelines. The recommendation is to increase the limit to 95 days – in coordination with the Move Update requirement.

Option 2:

Implement solutions with the USPS processing to ensure that only Free ACS notices are generated. This would require that past ACS notices are reviewed prior to the generation of new ACS notices. If the evaluation of past ACS notices indicates that the current notice would result in a Fee, then the notice is not generated.

This would certainly meet the mailers needs. However, the USPS will have incurred processing costs without necessarily realizing any benefit. Therefore, it is reasonable to restrict the use of such a capability to situations where mailers are ensuring reasonable action in a reasonable timeframe on the prior notices.

Additionally, the restriction of the additional notices (that would result in a fee) should have an additional time limit – after which the notices are generated with appropriate fees. A reasonable setting for this second time limit is 95 days (corresponding to the Move Update requirement).

5.3.1. Feature Input

Solutions being discussed in 122 would require changes in what appears on the mail pieces, service type codes, and what carriers look at to determine how to process the mail.

5.3.2. Feature Processing

The changes in processing range from relatively nothing (with changing the 30 day limit to 95 days), to significant changes affecting mailers, PARS, CFS Sites, and Carrier operations.

5.3.3. Feature Output

The output is simply ways to ensure Free ACS notices with Standard mailers provided that mailers are taking reasonable actions to resolve UAA mail in a reasonable timeframe.

Enhancement Request

Mailers' Technical Advisory Committee Workgroup # 121

Internal Workgroup Issues: 48

The One Category describing how this applies to ACS and Usage of ACS			All Categories That Apply				
Barrier	Hindrance	Enhancement	Cost	Performance /Quality	Timeliness /Schedule	Communi- cation	Inno- vation
50%	17%	33%	38%	31%	6%	0%	25%

6. Provide Secure Destruction of UAA Mail

Provide secure destruction of mail pieces that are disposed of by the USPS (i.e. not delivered to the recipient nor returned to the mailer). This need applies especially to First-Class mail, but mailers of other Classes of mail also have need for this service.

6.1. Business / Market Case

For some mailers, the need to ensure that UAA mail is securely disposed of prevents the use of some ACS options that could result in the disposal of some mail pieces by the USPS. These mailers need to utilize a solution that guarantees the return of the physical mail piece – so that the mailer can dispose of the piece securely.

There are other industry groups (such as MMA) that are detailing the secure destruction requirements and needs of the mailers

6.1.1. Mailer

Mailers would be able to select ACS-provided solutions in configurations that allow the USPS to dispose of the piece and the information is provided electronically to the mailer. The mailer receives the data faster. Since the information is already in electronic format, mailers can eliminate the costs and error potential of manual updates from returned pieces.

6.1.2. USPS

If mailers can not properly and efficiently process return mail, additional mail will be generated to the same, invalid address. In other words, additional UAA mail will be generated that the USPS will need to incur the costs to handle. Promoting the use of ACS allows for faster and more accurate processing of UAA mail by mailers, reducing future UAA mail volumes.

The USPS would encounter additional costs to ensure secure destruction of the mail. However, these costs could be justified by savings from not having to return the physical piece, not having to handle future UAA pieces, and even by the sale of the recyclable material. Or the mailer may have to pay a fee to access secure destruction.

6.2. Current Products / Processes Impacted

The USPS's processes for mail requiring disposal would need to be changed to meet the mailing industries' needs for the Secure Destruction of mail.

6.3. Feature Design Details

Detailed requirements and descriptions for what constitutes secure destruction of mail has been documented by other industry groups. The key is an implementation that ensures that all mail disposed of by the USPS at the mailer's request goes to secure destruction.

6.3.1. Feature Input

Mailers utilize ACS and configure accounts to allow for the USPS to dispose of the mailpieces (providing the ACS notices electronically).

6.3.2. Feature Processing

All mailer-requested mail disposed of by the USPS goes to secure destruction

6.3.3. Feature Output

Electronic notices of UAA mail and secure disposal of the physical mail pieces where requested by the mailers.

Enhancement Request

Mailers' Technical Advisory Committee Workgroup # 121

Internal Workgroup Issues: 5, 9

The One Category describing how this applies to ACS and Usage of ACS			All Categories That Apply				
Barrier	Hindrance	Enhancement	Cost	Performance /Quality	Timeliness /Schedule	Communication	Innovation
13%	38%	50%	40%	20%	20%	20%	0%

7. Ability to direct ACS™ Fees vs. Data with supporting data

There are a variety of real world situations where the final destination of the ACS information (both physical and electronic) differs from the final destination of ACS™ related fees. Mail preparers would like the ability to independently control the identification of who pays the ACS™ service fees vs. who receives the notices. To enable accurate reporting and billing for some of these scenarios, ACS™ invoices would need to include Mailer ID information.

7.1. Business / Market Case

In the mailing industry, there is a wide variety of relationships between Mail Preparers and Mail Owners. There is often a difference between who ultimately receives and processes the ACS notices vs. the ACS fees. Additional efforts are required by the mailing industry to support these situations. Changes from the USPS would support these industry needs, increasing the value of ACS by reducing recurring costs.

The first request is already somewhat supported, but could be improved upon. This is to support the ability to have the ACS notices (both electronic and physical) go to one location while any associated fees are directed to a separate location. An example for this is a mail preparer that maintains the mail owners list. It is the mail preparer that needs to receive the ACS notices to apply the necessary updates. However, it is the mail owner that ultimately pays the ACS fees. So, either the ACS notices and fees are directed to the Mail Owner (with the notices then re-directed to the Mail Preparer), or they are directed to the Mail Preparer (who needs to figure out and collect the appropriate ACS fees from the appropriate Mail Owner). NOTE: in some cases, all parties involved can be in the same company. The Mail Preparer is the mailroom and the Mail Owners are the different business units within the organization.

Allowing the ACS fees to be assessed directly from the USPS to the Mail Owner removes this administrative burden from the Mail Preparers while the notices are directly (and more efficiently) sent to the data processor.

When the Mail Preparer is offering the additional service of paying the ACS fees and then billing the Mail Owner, it is important for the Mail Preparer to be able to efficiently and accurately determine who to bill and how much. Currently, the Mailer ID appears on the shipping notices, but not on the invoices. With Traditional ACS, the identification of the account is the "Pub ID code" that appears on the address and is carried forward on the billing. Since that is being replaced by the Mailer ID code, it would seem both reasonable, and automatic, that the Mailer ID Code would also be carried in the data and the billing to associate to a source file / billable party. NOTE: in this scenario, this is only useful when a separate Mailer ID is used for each Mail Owner.

7.1.1. Mailers

Mailers have the option to directly receive the ACS fees – allowing for direct accounting and tracking – and, potentially, avoiding additional administrative fees from Mail Preparers or allowing for the payment of ACS fees to be handled by the Mail Preparers and included on a centralized invoice.

7.1.2. Mail Preparers

Mail Preparers will have the ability to support multiple configurations while minimizing potential administrative costs.

7.1.3. USPS

Providing support for real world configurations promotes the additional use of ACS services. Increased use of ACS services leads to reductions in UAA mail volume and the related costs incurred by the USPS.

7.2. Current Products / Processes Impacted

Currently, the only way a service provider (Mail Preparer) can pay a client's return costs is to connect all their postage due accounts to their CAPS account. The challenge for the Mail Preparer is that he may end up paying for more than what was intended. Since there is not a Mailer ID on the ACS™ invoices, the process of determining the correct fees to go to the correct mail owner is problematic.

7.3. Feature Design Details

Allow for the individual identification of destinations for ACS data and ACS fees. This needs to include the fees associated with the physically returned pieces.

The handling of the physical returns is a big issue – as the returns and fees are directed based on the information in the return address. One solution to address this issue is for the USPS to collect all of these physical returns and run them through an off-duty scanner, scanning the information into an electronic format for electronic delivery of

ACS information. This data could also be added into an NCOA^{Link} like database. This would permit processing to identify and block these addresses from future mailings by all mailers. Given the nature of lists we can assume there will be many future mailings impacted.

7.3.1. Feature Input

Changes to ACS account registration documents and procedures. Changes to the eDocumentation requirements detailed in the Guide to Intelligent Mail.

7.3.2. Feature Processing

The distribution of data and fees occur in accordance with the account configuration.

7.3.3. Feature Output

Data goes directly to the final processor. The fees go either to the ultimate payer or to a consolidator with the necessary information to allow for the appropriate association of fees to Mailer Owner to be billed.

Enhancement Request

Mailers' Technical Advisory Committee Workgroup # 121

Internal Workgroup Issue: 54, 22, 23, 41

The One Category describing how this applies to ACS and Usage of ACS			All Categories That Apply				
Barrier	Hindrance	Enhancement	Cost	Performance /Quality	Timeliness /Schedule	Communication	Innovation
29%	14%	57%	31%	23%	8%	23%	15%

8. Add Return Service Requested (RSR) support to ACS

Add support of a new processing configuration that supports a combination of Return Service Requested and ACS. This will allow for the electronic delivery of ACS information to the mailer and the return to the mailer of the physical mail piece for disposal.

8.1. Business / Market Case

When it comes to UAA mail, for many First-Class mailers there are two (2) main objectives. First, get the information (especially any new address) back and updated into their systems as quickly and efficiently as possible. Second, make sure that any mail with private information is disposed of securely.

Concerns over security and customer privacy continue to increase. Because the USPS does not provide for secure destruction of mail, many mailers are not able to make use of ACS. These mailers continue to use Ancillary Endorsements.

8.1.1. Mailers

With Ancillary Endorsements (such as Return Service Requested), mailers receive the UAA mail back. This mail must be sorted and routed to processing personnel. At a minimum, the processing personnel must convert the UAA information into electronic format for further processing and/or the updating of address information for future mailings. Once processed, the UAA pieces are routed for secure destruction (often back to the mailroom). This process is not time efficient while also being error prone and difficult to staff accordingly.

By combining RSR with ACS notification, electronic notices can be received and processed automatically – much sooner, and without the chance for additional human errors to be introduced. This reduces the possibility of mailing additional pieces to invalid or outdated addresses – i.e. more UAA mail.

The physical mail pieces that are identified as having ACS records already reported can be immediately routed for secure disposal.

8.1.2. USPS

By allowing more mailers to utilize ACS services (i.e. receive the electronic notices), UAA mail volumes will be reduced as a result of faster and more accurate processing of UAA information by mailers.

The ability to use ACS, specifically OneCode ACS, and the proposed pricing for the use of OneCode ACS with a Full Service implementation of the Intelligent Mail barcode will both give mailers an incentive to make the migration and cost justify the Full Service implementation of the Intelligent Mail barcode.

8.1.3. Environment

Any efforts that result in reductions of both the volume of UAA mail and the transportation of UAA mail benefits the Environment.

8.2. Current Products / Processes Impacted

PARS would need to be modified and CFS site procedures would need to be updated to support the RSR requested endorsement with ACS processing.

8.3. Feature Design Details

Fortunately, the actions to be taken by PARS and CFS Sites are already being performed. The difference is that instead of routing these pieces for USPS disposal, the use of the RSR endorsement would cause pieces to be routed for return to the mailer.

8.3.1. Feature Input

There would need to be new service codes created for use in the Intelligent Mail barcode.

8.3.2. Feature Processing

Because mailers are, essentially, requesting a combination of USPS services, the fee structure should reflect a combination of the current fee structure for Return Service Requested and ACS services.

8.3.3. Feature Output

Currently, there is a situation where both an electronic notice is generated and the physical piece is returned with a yellow label affixed. In this case, the label includes the text "ACS<-“ to indicate that an electronic ACS record was also produced. This would also be desired with the use of Return Service Requested and ACS.

Having an indicator on the returned mail that an electronic notice was generated will allow for mailrooms to perform validation and/or expedite the handling of the physical mail piece.

Enhancement Request

Mailers' Technical Advisory Committee Workgroup # 121

Internal Workgroup Issues: 7, 8

The One Category describing how this applies to ACS and Usage of ACS			All Categories That Apply				
Barrier	Hindrance	Enhancement	Cost	Performance /Quality	Timeliness /Schedule	Communication	Innovation
29%	43%	29%	50%	8%	33%	8%	0%

9. Add time factor to assessing different levels of ACS fees.

The determination of ACS fee levels should not just be based on the number of ACS notices generated, but also factor in the timeframe over which the notices were generated.

9.1. Business / Market Case

The current pricing models for OneCode ACS has a lower fee for the first two notices and a higher fee for any additional, duplicate notices. This is a hindrance to some mailers implementing ACS and a source of additional costs with no benefit to those that have implemented ACS.

There are many scenarios where a Mailer will be sending multiple pieces to the same address. One example is a person with multiple financial accounts. One person reported having 5 accounts with a financial company – 3 for themselves and 2 for their spouse. It is common for 5 quarterly reports to be generated and metered for mailing on the same day, yet the actual pieces typically arrive across 2 or even 3 days. It is a likely assumption that even if these were to match to a single Family COA, the resulting ACS notices would also be spread across multiple days.

A more common example involves mail to individual personnel at a business address. Again, it is quite likely that pieces from a particular mailing will be delivered across multiple days. Therefore, again, if the business moves there is likely to be many ACS notices generated across multiple days.

Bottom line, it is quite possible for the following to occur:

Day 1: First notice at reduced fee

Day 2: Second notice at reduced fee

Day 3: Notices beyond the second notice begin at the higher fee

Basically, the higher fee notices start being generated shortly after the creation of the first notice and far before any corrective action could have been taken by the mailers.

Because the USPS has implemented daily record delivery, there is no opportunity to perform a “duplicate” check across multiple days. In addition, USPS requires that each piece that carries a request for address correction must be fulfilled and paid.

The new pricing configuration for OneCode ACS used with a Full Service IMb Implementation includes the utilization of a similar time factor for Standard Mail and Periodicals.

A similar time factor should be implemented for all OneCode ACS notices. The determination of an appropriate time factor would need to be determined via a mutual review and discussions between the mailing industry and the USPS.

9.1.1. Mailers / ACS users

By eliminating this risk factor for additional and/or higher fees, mailers can more easily determine the ROI of implementing OneCode ACS and will reduce the implementation costs for many mailers (i.e. not need to investigate, design, and implement methods to avoid the additional and/or higher fee ACS notices that present little or no additional value).

By using the OneCode ACS, mailers receive the additional benefits of receiving ACS Notices and being able to apply the information to future mailings.

9.1.2. USPS

Increased use of OneCode ACS will allow for a reduction in future UAA mail. While there is a potential for a reduction in the amount of fees collected, the reduction is expected to be relatively small and able to be countered by the additional fees collected by the additional mailers that will elect to utilize the ACS services.

9.1.3. Environment

Any efforts that result in reductions of the volume of UAA mail benefits the Environment.

9.2. Current Products / Processes Impacted

The change would be fully within the ACS billing procedures.

9.3. Feature Design Details

In addition to tracking the number of notices, the date of the generation of the first notice would need to be stored. Then, fees would be determined based on both the number of the notice and the relationship of the date of the subsequent notices to that of the first notice.

9.3.1. Feature Input

The data of the first notice needs to be stored – which we believe is already being stored and reported.

9.3.2. Feature Processing

In determining the fee to be assessed, factor in the temporal relationship of this current notice to the first notice.

9.3.3. Feature Output

The assessed fees are such that the lower fee amount continues to be assessed even for notices beyond the second notice provided the notices occur within a specified timeframe from the first notice (still to be discussed and determined).

9.4. Impact of Full Service IMb

Of course, the proposal that all ACS notices will be Free with First-Class Mail pieces mailed under the Full Service IMB implementation will reduce the number of mailers impacted.

However, even the additional ACS savings may not result in a positive ROI to justify the expense for mailers to implement the Full Service option. This issue impacts all current OneCode ACS users and all future OneCode ACS mailers using the Basic IMb implementation option.

Enhancement Request

Mailers' Technical Advisory Committee Workgroup # 121

Internal Workgroup Issues: 56, 14, 31

The One Category describing how this applies to ACS and Usage of ACS			All Categories That Apply				
Barrier	Hindrance	Enhancement	Cost	Performance /Quality	Timeliness /Schedule	Communication	Innovation
14%	29%	57%	15%	46%	8%	23%	8%

10. Provide original name and address data for nixie notices

Currently Publication 8a (Traditional ACS) and 8B (OneCode ACS) state that the old name and address (what is presented on the mail piece) is not returned in the fulfillment file. It would be very beneficial for mailers to have the original name and address information provided within the nixie records of the fulfillment file to aid in matching the information to the source database for proper resolution for suspected UAA.

This request was originated as issues 56, 14, and 31 in MTAC workgroup 121.

10.1. Business / Market Case

Presently, the only way to effectively leverage nixie record information (a key source for potential UAA) is to match via a keyline code or the IMB serial #. While this may aid some mailers that have direct access to the source database and have implemented a methodology for automated matching, it hinders opportunities to leverage this crucial UAA related information in other situations.

10.1.1. Mailers using rented lists

By providing the original name and address, mailers can communicate nixie information back to the source list provider. This aids in reducing UAA for subsequent use of those names and addresses.

10.1.2. Mailers using Basic IMB

A major benefit of the Intelligent Mail® barcode is simplification of the address block. However, using basic IMB with Traditional ACS still requires a keyline code and thus contributes toward a cluttered address block. By providing the original name and address, mailers would be able to match back to the source data base for potential UAA resolution without the use of a keyline code.

10.2. Current Products / Processes Impacted

This request would impact nixie returns from both the PARS system as well as Computerized Forwarding Systems. The nixie record structure would also need to be modified to accommodate the new data fields. These new fields should follow the same format as a COA record.

10.3. Feature Design Details

Mailers would benefit from having the old addresses available for all current nixie codes.

- A Attempted, not known
- B Returned for better address
- D Outside delivery limits
- E In dispute
- I Insufficient address
- L Illegible
- M No mail receptacle
- N No such number
Not deliverable as addressed/unable to forward
- Q forward
- R Refused
- S No such street
- U Unclaimed
- V Vacant
- X No such office

10.3.1. Feature Input / Processing

USPS would need to completely change their current process, as currently they do not consider the delivery address or capture any information from it during the generation of nixie records

10.3.2. Feature Output

The modified nixie record would utilize the “filler” space from position 44 through 214 to contain the parsed old name and address.

ACS Notification File NIXIE RECORD FORMAT					
RECORD FROM	POSITION TO	FIELD NAME	LENGTH	COBOL	DATA TYPE
1	1	RECORD TYPE	1	9(01)	NUMERIC
2	9	SEQUENCE NUMBER	8	9(08)	NUMERIC
10	15	SIX DIGIT MAILER ID	6	9(06)	NUMERIC
16	16	FILLER	1	X(01)	SPACE
17	25	MAILPIECE IDENTIFIER	9	X(09)	A/N
26	39	FILLER	14	X(14)	SPACES
40	40	DELIVERABILITY CODE	1	X(01)	ALPHA
41	43	POSTAL SERVICE SITE ID	3	9(03)	NUMERIC
44	209	FILLER	166	X(166)	SPACES
210	214	FIVE DIGIT ZIP CODE OLD	5	X(05)	NUMERIC
215	412	FILLER	198	X(198)	SPACES
413	413	FEE NOTIFICATION	1	X(01)	A/N
414	414	FILLER	1	X(01)	SPACES
415	418	POSTAGE DUE	4	9(04)	NUMERIC
419	426	FILLER	8	X(08)	SPACES
427	427	NOTIFICATION TYPE	1	X(01)	ALPHA
428	458	INTELLIGENT MAIL BARCODE	31	X(31)	NUMERIC
459	459	FILLER	1	X(01)	FILLER
460	468	NINE DIGIT MAILER ID	9	X(09)	NUMERIC
469	559	FILLER	91	X(91)	SPACES
560	561	CARRIAGE RETURN LINE FEED	2	X(02)	CRLF

MTAC Work Group 121 Enhancement Requests

The following data fields would be added into positions 44 through 214 of the above specification.

PARSED COA NAME FIELDS					
44	63	SURNAME/LAST NAME	20	X(20)	A/N
64	78	FIRST NAME-MIDDLE NAME-INITIALS	15	X(15)	A/N
79	84	PREFIX	6	X(06)	A/N
85	90	SUFFIX	6	X(06)	A/N
91	91	ADDRESS TYPE OLD	1	X(01)	A/N
92	119	UBANIZATION NAME OLD	28	X(28)	A/N
PARSED OLD ADDRESS					
120	129	PRIMAY NUMBER OLD	10	X(10)	A/N
130	131	PRE-DIRECTIONAL OLD	2	X(02)	A/N
132	159	STREET NAME OLD	28	X(28)	A/N
160	163	STREET SUFFIX OLD	4	X(04)	A/N
164	165	POST-DIRECTIONAL OLD	2	X(02)	A/N
166	169	UNIT DESIGNATOR OLD	4	X(04)	A/N
170	179	SECONDARY NUMBER OLD	10	X(10)	A/N
180	207	CITY OLD	28	X(28)	ALPHA
208	209	STATE OLD	2	X(02)	ALPHA
210	214	FIVE DIGIT ZIP CODE OLD	5	X(05)	NUMERIC

Enhancement Request

Mailers' Technical Advisory Committee Workgroup # 121

Internal Workgroup Issues: 65, 70

The One Category describing how this applies to ACS and Usage of ACS			All Categories That Apply				
Barrier	Hindrance	Enhancement	Cost	Performance /Quality	Timeliness /Schedule	Communi-ication	Inno-ovation
29%	43%	29%	33%	42%	17%	8%	0%

11. Move Update: correction of invalid moves

There are situations where COA's are made available, determined to be invalid, and subsequently removed. However, mailers that already applied the new, invalid COA address are not provided with a method to correct the information. When this occurs, and in similar situations, the USPS should provide a process by which the invalid COA information can be corrected.

11.1. Business / Market Case

In situations where a person files a move from A-B but then needs to correct or cancel this COA, the USPS removes the A-B and also enters a B-A record. This way, any mailer that had already applied the B address will match to the B-A record and any future COA records associated with the A address.

However, there are still situations (although very infrequent) where the USPS simply removes the A-B COA record without adding a corrective B-A COA record. In these few cases, mailers who have applied the B address to their records have no USPS supported means to obtain the correct address information.

Many mailers need to be concerned about this situation as the ramifications can go far beyond losing contact with a client up to legal repercussions. Mailers may elect to implement such actions as their own Move Update confirmation processing along with the storage and tracking of prior address information. Obviously, this represents a potentially significant operational cost and impact to mailers. While working as a safeguard against the few invalid COAs, these actions and efforts will often result in the delayed application of the majority of the COAs which are valid.

The USPS already has processing in place to record corrective B-A COA records and makes that information available. The request is simply that there be no process by which an A-B COA record is removed (having found to be invalid) without the addition of a corrective B-A COA record. As the USPS has indicated, this situation happens very infrequently. Therefore, the impact to the USPS should be minimal – especially in comparison to the efforts that affected companies each need to take to accommodate for this potential issue.

An advanced request would be also to have a method to specifically identify the corrective B-A COA records as such. This would serve as additional flags to mailers for additional actions to be taken – such as the re-sending of prior communications, activation of potential fraud alert actions, or simply a special communication to reestablish contact with the client.

11.1.1. Mailer

By ensuring the creation of corrective COA records, this eliminates much of the concern over the potential application of invalid COA information that will not be corrected automatically as part of routine, future COA operations.

This will promote the use of COA information and especially COAs with recent Move Effective dates.

For some, this will eliminate the need for additional information storage and special processes.

11.1.2. USPS

This will promote the more timely application of COA information. Therefore, less mail will be generated requiring the USPS to perform mail forwarding operation (with the associated additional costs).

11.2. Current Products / Processes Impacted

Current processes that result in the removal of COA records need to be reviewed and changed to ensure that no COA's are removed without the addition of corrective COA records.

11.3. Feature Design Details

At a minimum, the corrective COA's appear the same as any other COA. The advanced request would be to specifically identify the corrective COA's as such. Within NCOA^{Link}, this could be done via new Footnote codes. In ACS, this could be done via new Deliverability codes. On manual notices (yellow stickers) a new code can be supported to indicate that the Order on File was a corrective order - this could be in addition to the current codes:

T=Temporary Away

C=Court Order Protected Individual

X=Forwarding Order Expired

R=Redirect due to a removed COA

11.3.1. Feature Input

None required.

11.3.2. Feature Processing

Information is detailed above.

11.3.3. Feature Output

Information is detailed above – including the advanced capability to specifically indicating COA records that were generated as a result of corrective actions.

Enhancement Request

Mailers' Technical Advisory Committee Workgroup # 121

Internal Workgroup Issue: 6

The One Category describing how this applies to ACS and Usage of ACS			All Categories That Apply				
Barrier	Hindrance	Enhancement	Cost	Performance /Quality	Timeliness /Schedule	Communi-ication	Inno-vation
14%	0%	86%	29%	29%	21%	7%	14%

12. Future CAPS Capabilities

The USPS has talked about changes to CAPS for some time. A specific set of meetings and/or workgroups should be formed to discuss the needs and desires of both the USPS and Mailers regarding changes to CAPS.

For example, mailers would like to pay ACS fees via a CAPS account rather than via a separate billing process.

12.1. Business / Market Case

By having meetings with the mailing industry to specifically discuss CAPS and any future changes, the mailing community can help the USPS:

- design a solution that meets the needs and maximizes the benefits to both the USPS and the mailing industry
- avoid working on features with low or no value to the mailing industry
- identify and set priorities

For example, ACS has always had a separate billing process. In the case of the manual notices, these fees are Postage Due. A Postage Due account can be tied to a CAPS account. It is a logical next step to support payment of ACS fees via a CAPS account.

12.1.1. Mailers

Such a specific set of meetings would allow for a focused analysis and discussion on CAPS and its future. Mailers will learn what the USPS is planning and be able to provide feedback on designs and priorities.

For Example, the pricing incentives of ACS with the use of Full Service IMb are expected to increase the number of users of OneCode ACS. There will still be ACS fees for many mailers. Having these fees also handled via a CAPS account allows for better management of postal operations and budgets. Therefore, the priority of linking ACS fees to a CAPS account is likely to be higher today than in the past.

12.1.2. USPS

Understanding the needs of Mailers will insure that efforts are focused on the items that will provide the largest benefit to the USPS and the mailing community.

For Example, connecting ACS into CAPS will allow for the reduction in the need for a completely separate billing process. It would be expected that assessing and collecting of the ACS fees via a CAPS account would result in lower USPS processing costs and increased revenue flow.

12.2. Current Products / Processes Impacted

Besides CAPS, any other products or processes that would be affected would be determined as part of the discussions between the USPS and the Mailing Industry.

12.3. Feature Design Details

This would depend on the results of the discussions.

For Example, to tie ACS fees to a CAPS account, both CAPS and ACS processes would need to be changed. As part of the ACS registration and update processes, mailers would need to be able to specify a CAPS account. The ACS billing processes would need to check for CAPS information and redirect the fees and report information to CAPS. CAPS would need to handle the fees and reports provided by the ACS billing process.

Enhancement Request

Mailers' Technical Advisory Committee Workgroup # 121

Internal Workgroup Issues: 16, 30

The One Category describing how this applies to ACS and Usage of ACS			All Categories That Apply				
Barrier	Hindrance	Enhancement	Cost	Performance /Quality	Timeliness /Schedule	Communication	Innovation
14%	57%	29%	43%	43%	7%	7%	0%

13. COA records will not DPV confirm

There are issues with ACS records that cannot Delivery Point Confirm (DPV). It appears that the USPS is using weekly DPV data, whereas the mailing industry uses DPV data updated monthly.

The USPS should consider adding an indicator via a DPV footnote denoting that the address will confirm on the subsequent monthly distribution of DPV data.

This request was originated as issues 16 and 30 in MTAC workgroup 121.

13.1. Business / Market Case

Addresses that cannot DPV confirm will be unable to receive an automation rate and thus pay a higher postage amount. This is a disincentive for mailers and appears to work against the drive to reduce UAA mail. The mailer must apply the record anyway, without an understanding of why the address does not confirm.

13.2. Current Products / Processes Impacted

This request would require a change to the DPV and underlying CASS-certified products. It would also require agreement from the software development companies to implement changes and leverage them within their address quality solutions.

13.3. Feature Design Details

13.3.1. Feature Input

The input would be the ACS / OneCode ACS provided new address.

13.3.2. Feature Processing

A new auto DPV confirmation of these records with a footnote of TI (timing issue). The software will set the DPV confirmation to 'Y' and the footnote would be AATI.

13.3.3. Feature Output

A new AATI (where TI denotes a Timing Issue) would be returned in the DPV enhanced product.

Enhancement Request

Mailers' Technical Advisory Committee Workgroup # 121

Internal Workgroup Issue: 55

The One Category describing how this applies to ACS and Usage of ACS			All Categories That Apply				
Barrier	Hindrance	Enhancement	Cost	Performance /Quality	Timeliness /Schedule	Communi- cation	Inno- vation
0%	14%	86%	8%	8%	17%	50%	17%

14. Communication for New or Updated USPS® Services

ACST™ participants would like a formalized and regular communication and opportunity for discussion relative to updates / enhancements to systems including PARS and CFS. Communication will discuss how changes will impact ACST™ participants.

14.1. Business / Market Case

By understanding timeframes for PARS and CFS updates, as well as what changes/enhancements will be made, ACST™ participants will be better able to prepare for the changes, leverage the value of the ACST™ program, and provide feedback to the USPS for the determination of project priorities.

For example, recently, the USPS implemented a change regarding how ACS data was to be posted. This change was to become effective the end of December. ACS users were notified of the change less than a month prior.

Additionally, in Q1 2009, an update to PARS is occurring to address an issue regarding the complete reading and reporting of the IMb. The changes are already being tested. Notifications of this issue and resolution are not expected until into 2009. Knowledge of this issue being addressed enables ACST™ users to better manage their implementation schedule. Knowledge that this was going to be addressed would have impacted some mailers implementation schedules for ACS and their decisions to implement internal solutions.

Bottom line, mailers can make the best decisions for implementation and future changes with knowledge of what the USPS is aware of as issues, is planning to address or change, and timelines for the changes.

14.1.1. Mailers (ACS users)

By being aware of issues in the ACS program, of pending changes (and timelines), and the backlog list of change requests, mailers can plan and schedule their own efforts to avoid the issues, prepare for changes, and provide feedback on the backlog list (priorities,

analysis). In other words, minimize their costs and risk factors while maximizing the returns.

14.1.2. USPS

Proper communication to mailers of issues and changes promotes happier mailers, easier implementations, and allows for vetting of potential changes.

14.2. Current Products / Processes Impacted

No products are impacted. This request is related to changes in current processes related to the communication of information. This request is to simply put a communication method in place relative to scheduled PARS and CFS enhancements. The key change in the current process is to involve the mailing industry in the planning, design, and scheduling discussions.

14.3. Feature Design Details

Communication could be made via RIBBS, the DMM Advisory, or e-mail notifications to ACS™ participants. This would include the maintenance of a back log list and implementation schedules.

14.3.1. Feature Input

The input needed includes a maintained backlog lists (showing issues to be addressed and potential enhancements to be implemented) along with implementation schedules.

14.3.2. Feature Processing

Detail the process flow of this enhancement request – Projected enhancements to PARS and CFS are outlined and scheduled by USPS®. Initial outline / schedule of project enhancements communicated to ACS™ participants (communication will discuss how changes will impact ACS™ participants and what steps may be required by ACS™ users) with follow-up communication as enhancements near completion. ACS users (and the mailing industry as a whole) need a venue that allows for the communication of issues, concerns, and ideas regarding outstanding issues and timelines.

14.3.3. Feature Output

Well documented and maintained backlog list and implementation schedules that reflect the needs and priorities of both the USPS and the Mailing Industry

Enhancement Request

Mailers' Technical Advisory Committee Workgroup # 121

Internal Workgroup Issue: 21

The One Category describing how this applies to ACS and Usage of ACS			All Categories That Apply				
Barrier	Hindrance	Enhancement	Cost	Performance /Quality	Timeliness /Schedule	Communi-ication	Inno-vation
29%	43%	29%	20%	60%	10%	0%	10%

15. Support 8pt Font of Endorsement

There are several print requirements that need to be reviewed and updated based on the abilities of USPS newer technologies for reading mail pieces and for mailer requests. One such update would include reviewing the font requirements for OneCode ACS®. This request is for consistent Font requirements for endorsements across all endorsement options (ASE, ACS™, OneCode ACS™) by implementing support of an 8 pt Font.

15.1.1. Business / Market Case

The DMM (102/202/302.4.4a or 3.4a) states that the type size of the endorsement must be at least 8 points.

This is the reference most mailers use when designing the mailpiece.

This is also stated in the Quick Service Guide 507d.

An endorsement must be printed in no smaller than 8-point type

And DMM 507

4.2.5 Additional Standards—When Using Human-Readable ACS Participant Codes

Mailers must use human-readable ACS participant codes according to the following specifications:

- a. Print and place the ancillary service endorsement according to the requirements in 102.4.0 and 1.5.
- b. Print the ancillary service endorsement and the participant code in a non-narrow variant of Helvetica or Arial sans serif font in the range of 10 to 12 points.

However, for Traditional ACS, Pub 8A states:

Font and Text Size

Print the ancillary service endorsement, the participant code, and keyline in a non-narrow variant of Helvetica or Arial sans serif font in the range of 10 to 12 points.

For OneCode ACS, pub 8b states:

Print all information in a non-narrow variant of Helvetica or Arial sans serif font with minimum of 8 point. We suggest that you print a range of 10 to 12 points.

15.1.2. Mailers

Supporting 8pt font would prevent confusion and allow for consistent use.

15.1.3. USPS

Encourages Mailers to participate in the Intelligent Mail® benefits for Address Change Service.

15.2. Current Products / Processes Impacted

Review and set one standard for the minimum type size – 8 pt type. If manual Address Correction Requested services only require the 8 pt minimum, and OneCodeACS only requires the 8 pt minimum, then change the ACS traditional to also have the same requirement. They are all processed on PARS or CFS now.

Mail processing equipment will need to be updated.

Changes to the DMM, QSG, Pub 25, Pub 8A, Pub 8B would be required.

Enhancement Request

Mailers' Technical Advisory Committee Workgroup # 121

Internal Workgroup Issue: 62

The One Category describing how this applies to ACS and Usage of ACS			All Categories That Apply				
Barrier	Hindrance	Enhancement	Cost	Performance /Quality	Timeliness /Schedule	Communi- cation	Inno- vation
0%	29%	71%	31%	23%	23%	8%	15%

16. Program location for Physical Return Mail and Notices

To enable the appropriate and desired handling of returned mail and manual notifications, allow for a method to programmatically define the location to which Physical Return Mail and Manual UAA Notices are sent (and charged to). This address may differ from the return mail address on the mail piece.

16.1. Business / Market Case

Mailers need to put one return mail address on the piece as it is the address to which customers are to mail general correspondences. However, the mailer may have a different location (perhaps even a third party) that is used specifically to handle the return mail. In this case, the desire is for physical return mail and manual notices to be delivered to a location that differs from the return mail address on the mail piece.

There are situations where the return mail address on the mail pieces represents the address of the permit holder / mail preparer but not the mail owner. It is to the mail owner that the Return Mail (UAA) pieces need to be returned along with any physical UAA notices.

Currently, if mail is selected to be returned, it is returned to the return mail address on the mail piece. It is the mail owner that needs the returns to process the information into their databases. Having the notice go to the mail preparer delays and complicates the process resulting in additional costs and delays is the processing of UAA information.

By allowing for the returns to be directed back to the List Owner, the mail preparer is taken out of the equation. Updates are received and can be processed sooner. Mail preparers do not need to worry about collecting additional fees from mailers for the return mail fees and the additional handling of the return mail.

The USPS is already implementing processes with the Full Service IMb implementation to allow for ACS notices and fees to be re-directed based on information in mailer profiles and the e-Doc. This is simply going the next step to impact physical returns and notices in addition to the electronic notices.

16.1.1. Mailer / List Owner

The list owners will be in direct control of their UAA mail. Fees will be applied directly to them and the actions to address the causes of UAA mail will be fully in their control.

16.1.2. Mail Preparer

Allows for the redirection of return mail and notices directly to the list owner (or list owner's representative). This will reduce the amount of return mail and notices received that need to be sorted, re-shipped along with fees counted, tracked, billed, and collected.

16.1.3. USPS

Since the Return Mail and notices are getting to the List Owners sooner, the information can be processed more quickly to impact future mailings (reduce future UAA mail volume).

16.1.4. Environment

Any efforts that result in reductions of the volume of UAA mail benefits the Environment.

16.2. Current Products / Processes Impacted

Changes would be need in both PARS and CFS software.

16.3. Feature Design Details

The key challenge is to connect the mailer supplied return address in real time to both PARS and at CFS sites that would need to use the information in the IMb to connect to mailer profile information to determine the desired location for the return of undeliverable mail pieces and the physical notices (and to whom to assess any associated fees).

The appropriate barcode would be used to direct these pieces and notices to the desired location.

16.3.1. Feature Input

There would need to be the ability to have information in the Mailers Profile to specify the desired return mail address and to whom to assess any fees.

NOTE: it should be possible to specify separate locations for the return of the physical mail pieces and notices vs. the associated fees. This will allow mailers / list owners to handle the fees but direct the returned mail and notices to an alternate location (company) being utilized specifically to process these items.

If the same Mailer ID is being used for multiple customers – this information would have to be supplied by the mailer as part of the e-Documentation submitted to the USPS with

the mailing. Connecting the information in the e-Documentation to the real-time processes in PARS and at the CFS sites is understood to be a significant technical challenge.

Realistically, this limits a single mailer ID to a single billing/return address.

16.3.2. Feature Processing

The key is the connection of PARS and CFS Site processing to the information in the Mailer's profile and/or the e-Doc. If there is information in both locations, the information in the e-Doc would take priority.

16.3.3. Feature Output

There is no difference in the data and results, just in the final destination.

Enhancement Request

Mailers' Technical Advisory Committee Workgroup # 121

Internal Workgroup Issue: 52

The One Category describing how this applies to ACS and Usage of ACS			All Categories That Apply				
Barrier	Hindrancel	Enhancement	Cost	Performance /Quality	Timeliness /Schedule	Communi-cation	Inno-vation
14%	14%	71%	8%	31%	15%	31%	15%

17. Mailer ID Inquiry Support

Information on Mailer ID's and their configuration get lost or forgotten. There needs to be a way for both mailers and Mailer Preparers to query the USPS for Mailer ID information.

17.1. Business / Market Case

The USPS sends confirmation information when a Mailer ID is assigned. But people leave companies, are re-assigned, and/or the information is simply misplaced. Currently, the USPS only deals with the mail owner when it comes to providing information about mailer ID's.

This leaves Mail Preparers to trust that the owners of the Mailer ID's truly know and understand what ID's they have and how they are configured.

There needs to be a process by which others can request Mailer ID information in order to confirm the profile information.

17.1.1. Mailers

For mailers that outsource their mailing operations, they are relying on others to be the experts. By allowing these 3rd party service providers to review and validate the mailers Mailer ID information, the mailer can rely on the service provider to ensure that mail is being generated as desired.

Allowing the mail preparers to validate the Mailer ID information can prevent potential delays and costs in mail production.

17.1.2. Mail Preparers

When there is a problem with a mailing, it often falls upon the Mail Preparers to rectify the solution. This represents additional costs and impacts on normal operations. On concern regarding the Mailer ID's is that the actual owners of the Mailer ID's are not mail experts. Therefore, they may request mail production and configuration in such a way that is not supported by the Mailer ID.

By allowing the Mail Preparers to review the Mailer ID profile information, they can confirm that the correct Mailer ID is being utilized for the given mailings. It eliminates the delays and potential errors of obtaining the information via the Mail Owner.

17.1.3. USPS

Since other third party, mail experts will be reviewing and confirming proper Mailer ID configuration and usage, there will be less of a burden upon the USPS to perform these activities and few problems at the point of mail validation and entry.

Additionally, by being able to review all the Mailer ID's of a particular Mailer, Mail Preparers can properly identify when an existing Mailer ID can and should be used, as opposed to obtaining an additional Mailer ID.

For example, a Mailer may not know if a Mailer ID used with another Mail Preparer belongs to the Mailer or to the other Mail Preparer. This will allow for such information to be obtained.

17.2. Current Products / Processes Impacted

The current process for Mailers to request their Mailer ID information should serve as a template for how others can request and obtain Mailer ID information for a particular Mailer and/or Mailer ID.

17.3. Feature Design Details

Any design will need to factor in the need for information, the need for expediency, and the need for privacy. Therefore, the request from 3rd parties for Mailer ID should follow a number of guidelines:

- Inquiries must include authorization from the Mailer / Mailer ID owner to disclose the requested information.
- Inquiries for Mailer IDs that do not belong to the indicated Mailer ID owner will be denied – with this reason indicated.
- Inquiries into invalid or non-existent Mailer IDs will be denied – with this reason indicated.

17.3.1. Feature Input

The actual implementation will depend on the level of security that is determined to be applied to such requests for information. Issues that will need to be considered include:

- What information is needed to identify the Mailer ID and expected Mailer ID Owner.
- What is required to indicate and/or confirm that the Mailer / Mailer ID owner has authorized distribution of their Mailer ID information to the 3rd party.

17.3.2. Feature Processing

The entire process should be designed with an SLA of 1 business day. Detail the process flow of this enhancement request.

17.3.3. Feature Output

The output should be a standard format for all inquiries and populated accordingly. The report should be sent to both the requestor and the Mailer / Mailer ID Owner.

The following report format / sample represents a potential layout for further discussion:

Mailer ID Inquiry Report

Request from: *Personal Name*
Company Name
Company Address
Phone
E-Mail Address

Request date: *date request submitted*

Mailer / Mailer ID Owner: *Personal Name (authorizing release of information)*
Company Name
Company Address
Phone
E-Mail Address

Process date: *date request processed (i.e. the information reflects data as of this date)*

Mailer ID	Status	Profile Information
<i>111111</i>	<i>Invalid / Not Exist</i>	<i><blank></i>
<i>222222</i>	<i>Incorrect Mail Owner</i>	<i><Blank, if allowed, identify correct owner></i>
<i>333333333</i>	<i>Valid and Active</i>	<i>Provide Mailer ID profile / configuration information</i>

Enhancement Request

Mailers' Technical Advisory Committee Workgroup # 121

Internal Workgroup Issue: 35

The One Category describing how this applies to ACS and Usage of ACS			All Categories That Apply				
Barrier	Hindrance	Enhancement	Cost	Performance /Quality	Timeliness /Schedule	Communi- cation	Inno- vation
14%	43%	43%	0%	22%	11%	67%	0%

18. Update Published Terminology between USPS publications

The verbiage used to describe ASE and ACS™ fees needs to be consistent amongst publications and also more accurately describe the service and well as the class of mail and processing category within that class. The USPS Rate Charts (i.e., Notice 123 Price List) refer to Manual, Electronic, and Automated rate levels. These should be redefined as ASE – Manual, ACS™ Traditional Electronic, and OneCode ACS®. There also needs to be clarification on what is covered (for example OneCode ACS® rates are for letters only).

18.1. Business / Market Case

An accurate understanding of fees associated with ASE, ACS™ and OneCode ACS™ is critical in the decision-making process of determining which solution(s) to use and well as management of the processes and costs once a solution(s) is implemented.

18.1.1. Mailers

For some Mailers, the decisions on the use of OneCode ACS® may be dependent on a correct understanding of the fees.

18.2. Current Products / Processes Impacted

Update the Rate charts, DMM, Pubs 8a and 8b to all use the same terms.

NOTE: this would need to go to pricing.

Not room in the Rate fold to add detailed description. But, could add a reference to where more detailed explanations are available.

Enhancement Request

Mailers' Technical Advisory Committee Workgroup # 121

Internal Workgroup Issues: 48

The One Category describing how this applies to ACS and Usage of ACS			All Categories That Apply				
Barrier	Hindrance	Enhancement	Cost	Performance /Quality	Timeliness /Schedule	Communi-ication	Inno-vation
57%	29%	14%	29%	36%	14%	21%	0%

19. Stop marking over address on Physical Returns

Marking over, stamping over, or placing a label over the original address and barcodes on physical returns hinders a mailer in their ability to quickly, efficiently and correctly process the returned mail. It also destroys the opportunity for USPS to create electronic records for Confirm and ACS, and usually the incorrect physical return of mailpieces that should have been processed through automated means.

19.1. Business / Market Case

For a mailing that occurred in the fall of 2008, following is what was found on a random sampling of 12 returned mail pieces:

- a black pen or marker used to:
 - put a slash or 'X' through the address
 - completely covered part or all of the original address. When partially blacked out, included blacking out:
 - ZIP and ZIP+4 only
 - PO Box number and ZIP and ZIP+4
 - Entire Last Line
- Hand written indicators of the UAA issue (like "IA", "ANK").
- The manually applied ACS, RTS labels with the appropriate check box marked by the Carrier
- a USPS stamp used to indicate the reason for non delivery
 - No such () street () number
 - Moved Left
No Address
 - Undeliverable
CMRA
No Authorization to Receive
Mail for this Addressee
 - The hand with the pointing finger and "Return to Sender" along with a list of UAA reasons (one of which is marked by a carrier).
 - The hand with the pointing finger followed by the text "ATTEMPTED NOT KNOWN"

- A USPS label with the pointing finger containing the text ‘Return to Sender’ along with a list of the potential reasons for non delivery (with one reason checked off).

One of the advantages of the Intelligent Mail barcode is the ability of mailers to uniquely identify each mail pieces. Therefore, analysis of the IMb on a return mail piece and allow mailers to precisely identify the business unit, system, database, and account record that the address came from – and therefore, requires corrective action. In addition, USPS cannot create the Confirm or OneCode ACS records the mailer expects from their use of the Intelligent Mail barcode. This is a significant USPS and mailer cost issue.

Along with destruction of the electronic tracking and address correction process, mailers often must perform additional, manual process to attempt to identify the record to which updates or corrective actions need to be taken on incorrectly physically returned pieces.. As was the case with the mailing referred to above, when the address is completely obscured by the marks, and not repeated within the contents of the mail piece, the mailers have no way to identify the original address that is in need of correcting. The mailer can not take any corrective actions on a piece that should have been processed electronically in the first place.

19.1.1. Mailer

Being keeping the original address information un-obscured, mailers can more quickly and accurately identify the record requiring corrective actions. This also allows for the possibility of automating portion of the return mail handling operations (improving efficiency and accuracy).

19.1.2. USPS

Destruction of the address block data, specifically the IM barcode and/or Traditional ACS text data destroys the opportunity for USPS to create electronic records for Confirm and ACS, and usually the incorrect physical return of mailpieces that should have been processed through automated means.

If mailers can not properly and efficiently process return mail, additional mail will be generated to the same, invalid address. In other words, additional UAA mail will be generated that the USPS will need to incur the costs to handle.

19.2. Current Products / Processes Impacted

Any changes are dependent on the education of the appropriate delivery unit personnel within the USPS that may be performing actions that obscure the original mailing address.

19.3. Feature Design Details

Mailers can and should make an effort to report such problems and supply samples to the USPS when this occurs. The USPS can use the reported information to identify problem routes or offices and the personnel that are in need of additional training.

19.3.1. Feature Input

There may need to be additional documentation and training of the appropriate USPS personnel to ensure proper handling of UAA mail.

19.3.2. Feature Processing

Correction of this behavior will increase USPS efficiency by processing the mail through automation as designed – reducing the manual return of pieces that should not received that treatment. It allows automation of the address correction process as designed, providing both USPS and mailers with efficiencies in the update process.

19.3.3. Feature Output

No incorrect, physical returned mail pieces where the original address information (including the IMb) are obscured by any marks or labels applied by the USPS.

19.4. Factors outside of the USPS's control

Of course, there will be cases where the marks were applied by the recipient of the mail piece rather than the delivery unit personnel. That is why samples of problematic mail pieces should be supplied to the USPS. If the same issue is reported for multiple addresses along particular routes covered by the same carrier, the marks are likely being applied by the delivery unit personnel – and training can be scheduled. If this is not the case, the marks were most likely applied by the original recipient before being returned to the Carrier for additional handling.

Enhancement Request

Mailers' Technical Advisory Committee Workgroup # 121

Internal Workgroup Issue: 21

The One Category describing how this applies to ACS and Usage of ACS			All Categories That Apply				
Barrier	Hindrance	Enhancement	Cost	Performance /Quality	Timeliness /Schedule	Communi-ication	Inno-ovation
17%	33%	50%	11%	33%	0%	11%	44%

20. Support Reverse Print of Endorsements

There are several print requirements that need to be reviewed and updated based on the abilities of USPS newer technologies for reading mail pieces and for mailer requests. One such update is allowing the ASE to be printed in reverse print.

20.1.1. Business / Market Case

This would be a benefit for all industries and markets. It especially is beneficial for marketing mail to allow for more creative design.

20.1.2. Mailers

Reverse print would allow mailers to have the ASE text fit better into the overall copy. For example, since mailers can have the Return Address and Permit Imprint Indicias printed in reverse print, so it would be beneficial to also have the ASE in the same format. The current requirement would be to use a knockout (example below).

Now



Proposed



20.1.3. USPS

The benefit to the USPS is that Mailers, especially direct marketing mailers, will be more likely to use the mail to reach their customers as they'll have greater creative-license with the reverse-print, while also being able to utilize the endorsement (and use of services like OneCode ACS™) to increase the value of current and future mailings.

20.2. Current Products / Processes Impacted

PARS and other mail processing equipment will need to be updated to allow for the reading of reverse type. This would apply not just to the Ancillary Service Endorsement, but other copy that the mailer can currently print in reverse type – such as the Permit Imprint indicia and the Return Address.

The CFS group would need to be informed to look for and read the reverse type.

Changes to the DMM would be required.