

MAILERS TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (MTAC)

Workgroup 129 Eliminating Obstacles to Mail Growth

Final Recommendations Report

**Gregory A. Hall, USPS
and Wanda Senne, World Marketing
MTAC 129 Co-Chairs
2/17/2010**

1 Executive Summary

The workgroup's efforts included 21 conference calls and two face-to-face meetings between the months of April 2009 and January 2010 (including all full workgroup and task group meetings). The workgroup was comprised of nearly 80 members from the mailing industry and the US Postal Service. The industry was represented by mail owners, mail service providers, publishers, printers, consultants, envelope manufactures, and equipment manufacturers. The US Postal Service was represented by Pricing, Mailing and Shipping Services, Operational Requirements, Mailing Standards, the Pricing and Classification Service Center (PCSC), Business Mail Acceptance, Sales and Stats Programs.

The workgroup assigned specific tasks to four separate task groups: Address Placement, Clean Release, Permit, and Undeliverable-as-Addressed (UAA) Tool.

The following report provides the workgroup's recommendations relative to eliminating obstacles to mail growth. All of these recommendations will be entered into the MTAC MITS RITS tracking system for MTAC Executive and Leadership consideration.

2 Scope of Input

Because it was important to build our recommendations based on a broad base of mailing industry input, each team member was invited to go back to their organizations and associations to solicit input on *Domestic Mail Manual* (DMM) standards that added no current value or represented barriers to mailing.

This initial call for input culminated in 91 responses, primarily from the mailing industry, but also from functions within the US Postal Service that deal with customers on a regular basis, such as the Pricing and Classification Service Center (PCSC). Additional concerns from MTAC Workgroup 126, "Growing Marketing Mail" were also incorporated into the responses.

3 Input Organization

The responses were reviewed individually and issues/ideas that were very similar in nature were combined. The group then discussed each issue, with additional input from its originator, and rated each issue/idea subjectively (high, medium or low) based on their impact on growth or their priority as a barrier to mailing. This resulted in thirty-eight items that were then further discussed in terms of their current relevance and their feasibility to implement.

Through discussions on calls and off-line research by the co-chairs and members, we found that some of the DMM standards for which change was recommended, such as the barcode clear zone, were still relevant with today's technology. Other ideas submitted were recommendations that were similar to those put forth by other workgroups or were already under consideration by US Postal Service functions, such as development of a secured destruction/recycling process for First-Class Mail.

Some ideas fell within the scope of responsibility of a US Postal Service team member, who agreed to take it on for further review and potential implementation, such as revisions to the design requirements for Business Reply Mail. And, one idea resulted in a DMM revision before the team completed its work.

All issues/ideas were thoroughly vetted and are presented on the following pages for US Postal Service consideration and implementation.

Table of Contents

1	Executive Summary.....	2
2	Scope of Input.....	2
3	Input Organization	3
4	Recommendations	5
4.1	Currently being considered by a USPS functional area:.....	5
4.2	Within the scope of responsibility of a USPS workgroup member agreeing to implement, or to give further review for potential implementation:	5
5	Task Group Recommendations.....	7
5.1	Address Placement.....	7
5.2	Permit Imprint	8
5.3	Undeliverable as Addressed (UAA) Tool	8
5.4	Clean Release	10
6	Other Recommendations.....	10
6.1	DMM section for Courtesy Reply Mail Issue 82	10
6.2	DMM Edit Suggestions Issues 24, 65, 72, 76 - 80.....	10
6.3	DMM Language: Return Address placement/delivery address. Issue 83	11
6.4	Tyvek envelope as a Flat Rate Priority Mail option. Issue 85.....	11
6.5	Relax the restrictions for simplified addressing on city routes. Issue 35, 63.....	11
7	Appendix 1: Issue Statement	13
8	Appendix 2: Workgroup Roster	14
9	Appendix 3: Postage Payment – Multiple Stamps Increase Open and Response Rate.....	16
10	Appendix 4: Domestic Mail Manual Changes	20
11	Appendix 5: UAA Tool	22

4 Recommendations

4.1 Currently being considered by a USPS functional area:

4.1.1 Develop a secured destruction/recycling process that will provide mailers the option to have their undeliverable-as-addressed (UAA) mail that would have been returned-to-sender, shredded into smaller pieces so that it will be impracticable to retrieve the information from the mailpiece. *Issue number 39*

Providing this service for UAA mail instead of returning it to the mailer is recognized as a potential new service offering that can reduce the cost of handling UAA mail for both mailers and the USPS. This effort is currently being considered by the USPS Vice-President, Sustainability and other functional areas.

4.1.2 Provide a discount/rebate for Courtesy Reply Mail (CRM) (lower price for outbound mail w/CRM enclosed or provide a rebate incentive to include CRM volume). Allow an over ounce weight allotment for those enclosing a remittance envelope. *Issues 40, 41*

Do not assess the outgoing mailing for additional postage weight. Mailers are not encouraged to put CRM into products because it likely pushes the physical weight that increases the postage cost. This is currently under review by the Manager, Transaction Mail and was a variation of a recommendation from MTAC workgroup 125.

4.2 Within the scope of responsibility of a USPS workgroup member agreeing to implement, or to give further review for potential implementation:

4.2.1 Relax some of the requirements for Business Reply Mail (BRM) design - horizontal bars, legend box type, design, etc. and improve ease-of-use for the process to obtain a BRM permit. Are design requirements

relevant with implementation of IMb? Recommend that the redesign involves input from volunteers from the Mailing Industry. *Issues 22, 62*

Manager, Transaction Mail agreed to pursue as part of a redesign of Business Reply Mail. The redesign effort will address standard operating procedures, payment options, accounting methods, design elements, and other areas needing improvement. At this time, the weighing, pricing and billing of BRM is primarily manual and the horizontal bars are still needed as a visual reference for the USPS employees to ensure each piece is properly accounted for. In the short-term, however, the Manager, Transactional Mail will work with Mailing Standards to relax the DMM rules regarding size and placement of the horizontal bars, type size, etc; and implement a communication plan to advise employees who handle BRM accordingly.

4.2.2 Revise requirements for Customized Market Mail (CMM) to make it less labor intensive and cost prohibitive. *Issue 13*

The PCSC and USPS Operations developed guidelines for a test of a variation of this concept in August of 2009 as a result of this recommendation. The USPS Manager, Direct Mail has agreed to conduct a test of a product that is a variation of this – “CMM Saturation Mail” – that would allow for partially die-cut non-rectangular flats to be entered as saturation mail.

4.2.3 Create a price or surcharge for mailpieces with non-paper surfaces such as plastic letter-size pieces, poly envelopes, heavy laminates, etc. that process on automation equipment but at lower efficiencies. Establish a price less than non-machinable surcharge due to some automation compatibility. *Issues 25, 47, 60, 74*

The USPS Manager, Direct Mail initiated a team of mailing industry representatives and US Postal Service functions to gather more information and samples.

4.2.4 Consider electronic requests for Periodicals publications as valid requests. *Issue 43*

The USPS Manager, Mailing Standards is considering a Federal Register Notice making electronic subscription/renewal requests for requester Periodicals publications valid when conducting USPS reviews and verifications of circulation without sending letters to selected electronic requesters. They currently count as valid when an audit bureau eligibility review is done.

4.2.5 Remove restrictions against manually affixing Repositionable Notes (RPNs) for destination-entered local mail. *Issue 91*

Referred to USPS Manager, Mailing Standards, who has agreed to write a Customer Support Ruling allowing this.

5 Task Group Recommendations

5.1 Address Placement

5.1.1 Relax the requirements for a return address on mailpieces with certain postage payment methods, such as precancelled stamps and company permits. *Issues 26, 38, 57, 58*

This task group discussed the requirements for return addresses on mailpieces related to postage payment with one or multiple precancelled stamps for unendorsed Standard and Nonprofit letter and flat pieces and Bound Printed Matter (BPM) Flats. Additional research was prepared by a workgroup member showing increased response rates and proven value of the use of mail. (See Appendix 3) Proposed language has been written and is being reviewed internally by the USPS.

5.2 Permit Imprint

5.2.1 Relax the requirements for Permit Imprint Design. *Issues 3, 28, 55, 71*

Allow more flexibility with decorative permit designs and placement of the permit in relation to the delivery address.

This task group designed and prepared several test decks and submitted them to USPS Engineering to conduct testing of formats of permit imprint designs that had decorative designs surrounding the permit.

The current standards only allow decorative designs to be placed to the left of the permit imprint. The testing did not provide sufficient data to develop definitive standards, but did indicate that the designs around the permit imprint could be processed effectively and that the current standards are too restrictive.

Recommend to allow the indicia to be below or to the left of the delivery address so long as it is adjacent. The Manager, Mailing Standards has agreed to write a CSR or revise the DMM regarding placement of an address above a permit imprint for ECR flats. Implementation will depend on successful internal clearance with other USPS departments.

5.3 Undeliverable as Addressed (UAA) Tool

5.3.1 Develop a user friendly tool to assist with the selection of the appropriate ancillary endorsement, associated fees, and the consequences of receiving returns. *Issue 46*

This task group developed a preliminary EXCEL spreadsheet that would facilitate the selection of the proper address correction ancillary endorsement and provide users the ability to estimate potential financial postage consequences of receiving returns. The spreadsheet is currently only for First-Class Mail Letters, but the task group recommends it be expanded to other types and classes of mail. Default industry standard values were provided that could be used (until a mailer determines what is actually happening in their operation). The current mailer numbers in the tool were chosen solely to test the calculations.

The UAA COA numbers for only using a Post mailing process and for those using both Pre and Post Mailing processes will need to be reviewed. The UAA numbers in the initial spreadsheet is identified "TBD." The task group recommended that the necessary study be performed by the USPS to determine the numbers.

It was also recommended that this UAA tool be developed further and deployed, including:

Expand the cost analysis sheet to include all types of mail including:

- Standard Mail Flats
- Bound Printed Matter

Have this tool as a resource for all postal personnel to access through:

- Blue Page
- Quick Service Guide
- PCC in a Workshop
- On line DMM
- Kiosk centers to demonstrate this tool

The group recommended that Address Management demonstrate the tool at the upcoming NPF.

Other placement options discussed included a PCC toolkit, Postal Explorer, and a Return on Investment (ROI) calculator.

The EXCELL spreadsheet can be located on the MTAC MITS website for Workgroup 129.

5.4 Clean Release

5.4.1 Review and update the standards for attachments to mailpieces such as stickers, clean-release cards, removable refrigerator magnets, small CDs on letter size pieces, etc. Issues 2, 30

Revised standards for stickers and clean-release cards became effective November 29, 2009. A task group was formed to gather feedback from customers based on the standards and to consider additional designs. Testing of some of the identified additional formats was completed. Continued follow-up is recommended for other types of attachments, such as labels and stickers. Results from the testing determined that adjustments to the November 29, 2009 standards can be made.

6 Other Recommendations

6.1 Add a section to the DMM for Courtesy Reply Mail that simply states that all the regular mailpiece designs apply. Currently, the only mention is under the use of FIM. Issue 82

USPS Manager, Mailing Standards, has agreed to add a DMM section on Courtesy Reply Mail (CRM) when they receive pending revisions to CRM (as a product) from the Product Manager in USPS Mailing and Shipping Services.

6.2 DMM Edit Suggestions Issues 24, 65, 72, 76 - 80

Linking CSR's to DMM language, more diagrams/charts/illustrations/user scenarios, references to other relevant documents, etc. A list of specific suggested changes and examples the team has generated was compiled and provided to USPS Mailing Standards. See Appendix 4

6.3 DMM Language: Return Address placement in relation to the delivery address. Issue 83

The DMM does not indicate that the return address needs to be to the upper left of the delivery address, as compared to above, above and to the left, in-line with it, below the delivery address, etc. To avoid situations of loop mail, the USPS recommendation for return address placement should be developed and published in a Federal Register Notice for comment. The desired outcome is for the recommendation to be included in the DMM.

6.4 Offer a Tyvek envelope as a Flat Rate Priority Mail option. Issue 85

Referred to the Manager, Expedited Marketing in USPS Mailing and Shipping Services.

6.5 Relax the restrictions for simplified addressing on city routes. Issue 35, 63

The workgroup did not reach a consensus on whether or not to move forward with a recommendation to expand simplified addressing to city zones. Some team members felt that this might encourage additional mailers to mail, perhaps as a test. Others felt that it could erode the value of the mailpiece and mailing lists that many mail service providers own and maintain. Additionally, using an address list allows controlling mailing preferences, for instance, not mailing to those that have requested to be

removed. USPS Manager, Marketing Mail, mentioned research that shows many customers do not respond negatively to simplified address mailpieces. He said that his group is looking into this concept, but there is no timeline for any changes yet.

After some debate, the team agreed to include this in our recommendations list, but to make a note that this item was not fully supported by all team members as there was some strong opposition against it.

7 Appendix 1: Issue Statement

Issue Title: Eliminating Obstacles to Mail Growth

Issue Originator: Workgroup 126 Growing Marketing Mail

Issue Statement: Facilitate mail volume growth by identifying regulations or requirements that add no postal and/or customer value hence hindering mail growth and proposing modifications or elimination of those barriers as practical.

Impact on Other Issues or Procedures:

A list of Postal Service organizations or areas impacted includes but is not limited to: Mail Processing Operations, Delivery Operations, Business Mail Acceptance, Mailing Standards, Pricing, Shipping and Mailing Services, Finance

Mailing industry operations impacted include: Design and Creative Functions, Mail Production, Strategic Planning, Budget

Desired Results:

1. Allow for greater flexibility in such things as mailpiece shape, graphics, postage payment and permit formats.
2. Allow marketers more creative options for producing direct mail pieces that stand out in the mailbox, increase response rates and can be processed efficiently.
3. Reduce the barriers to entry and costs of preparing mailings by simplifying or eliminating obsolete or restrictive make up and entry rules that add no postal or customer value.
4. Consider new rate categories for mailers who may value creative flexibility and ease of preparation over the lowest postage rates.
5. Remove barriers that may discourage the use of mail as an advertising channel for new business.

8 Appendix 2: Workgroup Roster

Name	Company
David Asano	Pitney Bowes
Frank Auer	USPS Sales/Strategic Service
Maynard Benjamin	Envelope Manufacturers Association
Bob Bokor	USPS PCSC
Lisa Bowes	intilisent
Steve Burkat	USPS PCSC
Norine Butte	NASML
Chuck Cairatti	McQuiddy Classic
John Callan	Ursa Major Associates
William Chatfield	USPS
Linda Clayton	USPS
Steve Colella	Calmark, Inc.
Adam Collinson	Pitney Bowes
Judy Costello	Quadriga Art Inc
Debbie Cumbo	USPS BMA
Greg Dawson	USPS Pricing Strategy
Vincent DeAngelis	Distribution Solutions & Intelligent Mail Pitney Bowes
Gene A. Del Polito	Association for Postal Commerce
Rod Devar	USPS Manager Direct Mail
Becky Dobbins	USPS
Rich Domagalia	Mystic Logistics
Krista Finazzo	USPS Operations
Paul Finn	USPS
Rose Flanagan	Data Mail
Tom Foti	USPS Manager Marketing Mail
Joy Franckowiak	Valpak
Paul Giampolo	Valassis
Yvonne Gifford	USPS
Jay Gillotte	Presort Services
Gregory A. Hall	USPS Manager PCSC & Workgroup Postal Co-Chair
Don Harle	Diamond Marketing Solutions
Sharon Harrison	AT&T
Max Heath	Publishing Group of America, Landmark Community Newspapers
George Heinrich	The Postal Professor
Lisa Henrich	Oles Envelope Corporation
Leanne Herman	Times Printing Company Inc.
Michelle Hilston	Consolidated Graphics Group
Charley Howard	Harte-Hanks
Keith Judkins	National Association of Advertising Distributors
Karen Kaczmarek	MSP

Name	Company
Dennis Kaylor	Our Sunday Visitor
Terry Knupp	USPS Sales/Strategic Service
Don Landis	Arandell
Jerry Lease	USPS Mailing Standards
Elizabeth Lombard	Pitney Bowes
Ken Male	USPS
David Mastervich	USPS
Eddie Mayhew	Eddie Mayhew's Classification Station LLC
Dave Meyers	PCH
Tim McGinley	USPS
Dale Miller	RR Donnelley
Steve Monteith	USPS Mailing & Shipping Services
Jennifer Nachuk	Access Worldwide
EC Nix	DST Mailing Services
Dan O'Brien	First Data
Mike O'Hora	USPS BMA
Sharon Owens	USPS Mailing & Shipping Services
Gregory Parsons	PSA
Jeff Peoples	WindowBook
Debbie Pfeiffer	Pitney Bowes Presort Services
Anita Pursley	Worldcolor
Laine Ropson	Ropson & Associates
Kurt Ruppel	IWCO Direct
Cher Rupp-Ruggeri	USPS BMA
Tonda Rush	American Press Works
Wanda Senne	World Marketing, Workgroup Industry Co-Chair
John Sexton	Pitney Bowes Presort Services
Kathleen Siviter	Postal Consulting Services, Inc.
Jeff Stangle	Pitney Bowes
Elizabeth Stewart-Murray	USPS PCSC
Paula Stoskopf	BCC Software, A BÖWE BELL + HOWELL Company
Randy Stumbo	Meredith
Ty Taylor	JC Penney
Raj Thayalan	Epsilon
Sue Thomas	USPS
Chuck Tricamo	USPS PCSC
Karen Tucker	USPS
Craig Vance	USPS Operations
Mike Winn	Greylock Associates LLC
Carrie Witt	USPS

9 Appendix 3: Postage Payment – Multiple Stamps Increase Open and Response Rate

Overview

For many years, professionals in the direct marketing industry have developed many practices to assure success in hard copy communications delivered through the United States Postal Service. Among the best practices is an approach to affix multiple postage stamps on outgoing direct marketing promotions to increase the length of time recipients review a mailpiece which will increase open and response rates.

It is estimated a prospect will consider a direct mail package for only a second or two before deciding whether to read it immediately, set it aside for later, or simply toss it (United States Postal Service, 2001).

This paper is to provide support for the use of multiple postage stamps for the Mailer Technical Advisory Committee Workgroup 129, “Eliminating Obstacles to Mail Growth”.

Concept Support

David L. Duffy and Nicholas G. Martin with the Queensland Institute of Medical Research, Brisbane, Australia, conducted a study on twins in November of 2000 that support the success of the multiple stamp concept. While their research was primarily related to the return device, they also found that, “In a similar vein, increasing the number of stamps on the questionnaire mail-out envelope has been shown to increase the response rate over those sent with a single stamp” (Duffy & Martin, 2001).

(It is interesting to note that the reply envelope with multiple stamps pulled a 71% rate compared to 60% with one stamp in one pilot.)

Wayne E. Hensley, reported, “Increasing the response rate of a mail questionnaire may often be dependent on seemingly unimportant details. As a case in point, the use of multi-colored commemorative postage stamps has been recommended as a device to ‘increase results over and above any other method...” (Hensley, 1974)

Marcia Hoeck, How to avoid the “later” pile

“It would be wonderful if our clients and customers were so eager to hear from us that whenever we contacted them in any way, they immediately responded by purchasing our products and services or taking the action we’d like but that isn’t likely to happen! **There are ways, however, to increase response rates** with various customer touch points.

5. Extra tips for direct mail response

Here’s a bonus section for direct mail programs using traditional mail:

- real postage stamps on envelopes outpull postage meters or bulk mail permits for open rates
- special or commemorative stamps outpull regular postage stamps for open rates
- stamps on an angle outpull stamps put on straight for open rates
- **multiple stamps adding up to total postage outpull single stamps for open rates** (Hoeck, 2007)

Denny Hatch, *“2,239 Tested Secrets for Direct Marketing,”* p 185

Postage tests by Disabled American Veterans in the fall of 1981 (postage was \$0.20) tested five four-cent stamps (which was the control) against two 10-cent stamps increased the net after the cost of stamp affixing by \$262/M on the \$10 and over donors and \$125/M on the \$5 to \$9.99 segment. The greater the number of stamps, the higher the response rate (Hatch & Jackson, 2009).

Robert W. Bly, Professional copywriter and marketing consultant

In *“9 Strategies for Improving Your Outer Envelope,”* Robert Bly provides tip number 6. “... use **multiple low-domination stamps** to reach the total required for postage... It’s not uncommon for a marketer to invest a tremendous amount of time, effort, and money in a new direct mail package, and then create the outer envelope almost as an afterthought. That’s a mistake, because tests have shown that varying the outer envelope can increase or depress response rates in an A/B split – even if the mailing inside is identical – by 25% to 100% or more” (Bly, Robert W, na).

Tom Ellis, *“Report Shatters Myth that Effective Direct Mail is Difficult for Nutritional Retailers”*

Other Personal Touches. Include a note on the letter. Hand address the envelope. Use **postage stamps instead of bulk mail, and use a few stamps** totaling 33 cents rather than one. **Multiple stamps** in a variety of colors and patterns remind the reader of letters they have received from relatives (Ellis, 2000).

DeAnna Spencer, *“101 Ways to Improve Your Direct Mail Response”* Learn Small Business – Small Business Tips for Entrepreneurs

“Direct mail can be a powerful way to reach your customers. However, it is only powerful if used effectively. Here are some tips to help your direct mail campaign be successful.

Tip Number 71: Try a massive display of stamps on the outside of your envelope to emphasize a fact” (Spencer, 2009).

Deer Farmer & Elk Farmer’s Information Network, November 2002, Vol. 3 Issue 11

“With all the recent fascination with electronic communications technologies - Internet, cell phones, broadcast fax - many agri-businesses have neglected an old marketing tool - direct mail marketing.

Some research findings

Here is some important research related to direct marketing:

1. The best months for direct marketing are January, February, September and October. The worst months are July and August. As a rule, the worse the weather, the better the climate for direct marketing.

2. **Think creatively about stamps. Multiple stamps** or a stamp from a foreign land gets attention” (Sawchuk, 2002).

USPS, Direct Mail by the Numbers

“Tricks of the Trade: Did you know that... Trick number 4: “Live” stamps (the kind you use at home on your bills) usually get more response than metered postage?” (United States Postal Service, 2001).

Jody Adkison, Vice President, Procurement & Production, Grizzard

The multiple stamp strategy works for several reasons...

1. Our mail piece is noticed
2. Our donors perceive the stamps as a “struggle” from the charity to meet the postage costs
3. Our donors perceive the piece as a more personal approach

USPS innovation controls:

Marketing in the mail these days REQUIRES innovation for that split second ...“second look”. The market place is changing and ONLY innovative packages are being given that chance of a second look. The more production innovation is restricted, the less results and the less our clients want to spend their marketing dollars on using the **USPS product**. The client is being pushed hard every day to spend their advertising dollars on other company products ...companies that do appreciate and understand innovation leads to results AND appreciates those client advertising dollars (Adkinson, 2009).

Alliance of Nonprofit Mailers, 1211 Connecticut Ave NW Ste 610, Washington DC 20036-2705 is gathering data from their members who have used multiple stamps on their promotions (Conway, 2009).

Summary

Direct Mail and other industry professional's research and experience support and recommend the use of multiple "live" or pre-cancelled postage stamps on outgoing direct mail marketing pieces. This practice improves the longevity of the "mail moment" and promotes increased open and response rates.

References

- Adkinson, J. (2009, November 8). Vice President Procurement and Production, Grizzard. (W. Senne, Interviewer)
- Bly, Robert W. (na). *Robert W Bly*. Retrieved October 29, 2009, from Robert W Bly: <http://www.bly.com/newsite/Pages/DMNCOL13.htm>
- Conway, T. (2009, November 4). President, Alliance of Nonprofit Mailers. (W. Senne, Interviewer)
- Duffy, D. L., & Martin, N. G. (2001, April na). *Genetic Epidemiology*. Retrieved October 29, 2009, from Queensland Statistical Genetics Laboratories: http://genepi.qimr.edu.au/staff/nick_pdf/CV295.pdf
- Ellis, T. (2000, May na). *Nutritional Marketing*. Retrieved October 29, 2009, from Ellis Communications: <http://www.nutritionalmarketing.com/PressRelease/press5-003.htm>
- Hatch, D., & Jackson, D. (2009, October 29). *Google Books*. Retrieved October 29, 2009, from Google Books: http://books.google.com/books?id=DnttjSdXh3gC&pg=PA186&lpg=PA186&dq=Increase+response+rate+multiple+stamps&source=bl&ots=ujhE7GIQGg&sig=HE768ZEyyS2AZICQAcvIDYoHQdo&hl=en&ei=pH_pSovillrj8Qb9i_WSDw&sa=X&oi=book_result&ct=result&resnum=9&ved=0CCUQ6AEwCDgU#v=
- Hensley, W. E. (1974, Summer na). *JSTOR: The Public Opinion Quarterly*. Retrieved October 29, 2009, from Public Opinion Quarterly: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2748056>
- Hoeck, M. (2007, December 29). *Meaningful Marketing*. Retrieved October 29, 2009, from Hoeck Associates, Inc.: <http://www.hoeckblog.com/meaningfulmarketing/category/direct-response/>
- Sawchuk. (2002, November na). *Deer & Elk Farmers' Information Network*. Retrieved October 29, 2009, from Deer and Elk Farmer Digest Newsletter: <http://www.deer-digest.com/html/nov02.html>
- Schoewe, Peter. (2007, April na). *Mal Warwick Associates Resources*. Retrieved October 29, 2009, from Mal Warwick Associates: <http://www.malwarwick.com/learning-resources/e-newsletters/april-2007.html>
- Spencer, D. (2009, na na). *101 Ways to Improve Your Direct Mail Response*. Retrieved October 29, 2009, from Ezine Articles: <http://ezinearticles.com/?101-Ways-to-Improve-Your-Direct-Mail-Response&id=3391>
- United States Postal Service. (2001). *Direct Mail By The Numbers*. Washington DC: United States Postal Service.

10 Appendix 4: Domestic Mail Manual Changes

An instance where the DMM needs to be more explicit:

11 201 Physical Standards

[1.0 Physical Standards for Machinable Letters and Cards](#)

[2.0 Physical Standards for Nonmachinable Letters](#)

[3.0 Physical Standards for Machinable and Automation Letters and Cards](#)

11.1 1.0 Physical Standards for Machinable Letters and Cards

11.1.1 1.1 Physical Standards for Machinable Letters

11.1.1.1 1.1.1 Dimensional Standards for Letters

Machinable letter-size mail is:

- a. Not less than 5 inches long, 3-1/2 inches high, and 0.007-inch thick.

Nowhere in the Machinable letter section does it refer to 101.1.2. It is easy to see why someone would not know to look there – for example, if the piece is over 4-1/4" x 6" and only .007" thick.

Enveloped letter mail may weigh between 3.3 and 3.5 ounces TO BE MAILED AT AUTOMATION PRICES. It MUST be barcoded in the address block. If it is in a window the window must be covered.

How can this be more easily explained in the DMM?

Consider a decision tree in a QSG.

Example of one type of chart that would be more clear.

Type Size	2 pt	Space between address lines
	4 pt	Minimum point size for permit imprint
	8 pt	Minimum point size for Ancillary Service Endorsements, except for ACS
	8 pt	Minimum size for address fonts
	3/16"	Minimum size for BRM Legend
	10 to 12 pt	Minimum point size for Ancillary Service Endorsements for any ACS

10 to 12 pt	Ideal point size for address fonts
18 pt	Maximum size for address fonts

Re-organize the DMM to eliminate duplicate information. There could be a section on Processing Category – after all a letter has the same dimensions regardless of class of mail.

Add new information that is in chart format – and is easy to read. Example of a chart for the different type sizes.

Type Size	2 pt	Space between address lines
	4 pt	Minimum point size for permit imprint
	8 pt	Minimum point size for Ancillary Service Endorsements
	8 pt UC	Minimum size for address fonts
	3/16"	Minimum size for BRM Legend
	10 to 12 pt	Minimum point size for Ancillary Service Endorsements for any ACS
	10 to 12 pt	Ideal point size for address fonts
	18 pt	Maximum size for address fonts

- Add all information that was approved as a CSR.
- Add all information that is part of other publications that are also covered somewhat in the DMM. This does not mean to put ALL the information from the other pubs in the DMM, just that there should be nothing new or different in the pubs.
- Add more charts and pictures. Make the exhibits show more of the options (like not having the periods in “U.S. Postage Paid”)
- Add User scenarios – for example, if someone is considering ACS they need to review 507 to understand the treatment of UAA and the costs, then the section on ACS, etc.
- Don’t put anything in the rate charts that is not in the DMM – such as how the pricing is done for Full-Service ACS. The exact rate does not have to be put in (updating would be a nightmare) but the price group and rules should be.

The DMM does not define the position of a return address in relation to the delivery address. It does not say that the Return address needs to be to the upper right of the delivery address, as compared to above, above and to the right, in-line with it, below the delivery address, etc.

If the equipment makes decisions based on location (scanning to determine that the address below the postage area is the Delivery address, etc.), then this needs to be clearly defined.

Update the DMM 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. Three examples of Customer Support Rulings recommended to include a hot-link in the DMM: PS-124, PS-275, and PS-332 – there are many others - these are only intended to provide examples.

The examples submitted to Mailing Standards included screenshots of the actual DMM text and explained why the hot-link to the CSR would be helpful in each of these cases.

Consider color coding for recommendations vs. requirements.

Consider publishing a DMM Advisory with a reminder about CSR availability.

11 Appendix 5: UAA Tool

The EXCELL spreadsheet can be located on the MTAC MITS website for Workgroup 129.