

MTAC WORKGROUP 129
Meeting Minutes

WEDNESDAY, MAY 13, 2009 TELECON

The team began further review and discussion of the issues list. Discussion of issues that were submitted by stakeholders who were not present on the call was deferred to a time when they could be present. We began ranking items the items 'H', 'M', or 'L' and the spreadsheet will be updated accordingly.

It was also decided that the minutes would contain a high level description with appropriate detailed comments as needed. In addition, any items that are Out of Scope will be moved to another tab marked as such.

Since we did not complete the ranking of all items, the ranking will continue at our next meeting on Wednesday, May 27, 2009. The following comments were made and recorded for the items that were discussed.

Item #	Comments	Ranking H-M-L
48	Content requirements were discussed such as ride-alongs. Perhaps there could be information provided targeted to advertising agencies regarding eligible/permissible content in Periodicals (acceptable inserts). Max commented that these items could also be discussed at the PAG on July 29, 2009 here at the PCSC. Content rules could change. There could also be incremental ride-along charges.	M
51	There may need to be more detail provided. Cher mentioned that we can start with a review of the CSR PS-327.	L
9	Mailers need guidance on which direction to proceed. Education is needed at local level by a BME or BMS representative. This item may be moved to the Out of Scope tab. However, if customers are educated as to whether a manifest or Optional Procedure agreement/program should be used, would be an easier decision if mailers knew enough about these programs to make an informed decision and stay in the mail.	L
13	Some of the restrictions for CMM should be removed to ease the burden on mailers but we need more specifics on this.	M
19	This item will be moved to an Out of Scope Tab	L
26	Return address should be on the outside of mailpieces with PC stamps – but not necessary for those with permit imprint. Could we have alternative methods of preparation to preclude mailers from printing the return address?	H
TBD	Greg Parsons from PSA suggested a 'faux' stamp in lieu of a conventional stamp to encourage creativity. This should become a separate line item.	
29	There could be some DMM language changes for this item. Chuck will review.	L
58	Why would address be needed if IMb (for full service customers) has info? However, IMb does not have mailing location but return address may not represent it either. Return address needs to be where mailer keeps records. Perhaps have various return addresses on mailpieces depending on where pieces are mailed.	H
38	No real comments or follow-up, but ranked H	H
27	Maynard commented that there could be some flexibility for domestic return addresses, but there are UPU restrictions for foreign mail. This standard is more applicable for flats because of the new addressing standards.	L
55	No real comments or follow-up, but ranked	H
3&28	Could be combined with #55	H
28&3	Could be combined with #55	H
71	The DMM may be changed to reflect these recommendations.	H

MTAC WORKGROUP 129
Meeting Minutes

Item #	Comments	Ranking H-M-L
23&4	Encourage mailers to submit postage statements electronically.	M
TBD	Greg Parsons commented on a new idea whereby mailers could have a 'Business Class' service where their Standard mailing could be given First-Class Mail treatment for large mailings across the country.	
4&23		M
50	Should be combined with #27. Wasn't discussed since Jay was not on the call.	L
11	More detail is needed and could be moved off to O-O-S tab.	L
57	Multiple stamps can't be reported in mail.dat.	M

The dial in information for our next meeting is as follows:

Wednesday, May 27
10:00 – 11:30 Eastern
866-567-8049
ID 4442566