

## MTAC Workgroup 129 Meeting Minutes August 4-5, 2009

These minutes contain the output of the August 4 (WG 129 task group for permit-related items) call and today's call for the main workgroup.

Our next meeting will be 'face-to-face' on Tuesday, August 11, 2009 from 3:30-5:00 PM in 1P410 at USPS Headquarters. Wanda will provide call-in information for those that will not be attending.

The taskgroup discussed the following items:

Item #	Comments
55	More attractive designs result in mailpieces that stand out and solicit a response. Mailing Standards will draft proposed new designs and standards to share with the team. Representatives from operations and product management (Karen Tucker and Bill Chatfield) will be involved as well. Current designs will be shown against proposed designs to generate further discussion.
58&38	Where should return address and permit info be placed on the mailpiece? PARS impacts need to be identified and considered. Max said that permit indicia could be somewhere other than to the right of the address as long as it is at the top. This would have flexibility for quarter and half-folded pieces. Impacts need to be identified for having return address on inside of mailpiece (for unendorsed pieces). Consider printing a Mailer ID next to the permit imprint or in the OEL. Need to ensure that the return address would allow for return to an office where action could be taken. Bob & Mike Ohora will talk to BMA about providing sample images of what this ID would look like for the "face-to-face".
28	Ensure more creative designs for permit but consider that class of mail, company name and permit info be identified in designs so as not to cause confusion between First-Class and Standard Mail. Carrie Witt mentioned that there needs to be more consistency in design elements but not restrictive but as long as all data was on the piece. She also discussed the Origin Destination Info System (ODIS) Revenue, Pieces and Weight (RPW) tool. This tool depicts sophisticated statistical models that show where permit data should go and collects volume data and what types of pieces to sample. Carrie has data to show types of pieces that have been sampled and with respective comments. Data collectors have info on different types of pieces. The IMb might allow for more flexibility but at this time, the USPS is not capturing all data in the IMb. Clarity in our standards is needed for what is human-readable and what is not until at least it can be captured in the IMb. Wanda prepared various sample designs to illustrate suggested changes. The designs were submitted to the group and to Susan Thomas for review.
71	This is not an issue in the field because mailpieces have been accepted with and without the periods after the 'U' and the 'S'. Customers want more flexibility in permit design – the periods are not a concern but the hyphen between 'First' and 'Class' is because it is a USPS trademark. Care needs to be taken so as not to comprise the trademark and involve Intellectual Property.

The main workgroup discussed the following items relevant to the DMM (blue color code):

Item #	Comments
24	Bob said that CSRs serve to make it easier for customers to get clarification on DMM standards. Acceptance unit people don't want to access the DMM & CSRs. The DMM should be updated to reflect CSR updates (when applicable). Even though there is a link to the applicable DMM section once you're in a CSR, there should be a link in that section to go back to the CSR. The DMM advisory serves to advise customers about changes. It was suggested some examples of where CSRs serve to clarify standards to not show a contradiction. As of press time, Michelle Hilston had e-mailed examples.
65	Separate requirements and recommendations – DMM should only contain the rules – not recommendations (there would be far too many). Identify those areas where there is confusion. Consider 'color coding' for recommendations vs. requirements, for training purposes. Consider publishing a DMM Advisory with a reminder about CSR availability.
79	Consider providing more charts/grids/pictures where applicable. The team will come up with some ideas for where these would be useful in the DMM.
81	There are some situations that need to be identified by the workgroup. Frank mentioned that David Mastervich will get involved to discuss a tool that will help address ACS concerns from a pricing perspective. It was also recommended that this item be moved off the high priority list.
82	There needs to be more explanation for CRM – handled like other outgoing mail (link to 201.3.14). Should be a separate section for CRM in the reply section – then link to the reference. USPS Mailing Standards indicated they would make the change.
83	Why isn't location of return address identified on mailpiece in 602.1.5? PARS impacts for letter mail need to be identified and considered. USPS HQ and PCSC will discuss and report back to the group.