

MTAC Work Group 152: Explore Moving to 5-Digit File Structure

Agenda – January 17th, 2013

14:00 – 14:05 Attendance

We did not take attendance this time due to technical difficulties.

14:05 – 14:10 Agenda Review

14:10 – 14:20 Recap Last 4 Meetings

The work group met four times last year: twice in November and twice in December. The two meetings in November were for the kickoff. We discussed the charter and started to talk about potential benefits, issues, and systems to consider. Then, during the first meeting in December, we talked about the FSS Mail Entry issue which, in part, led to the creation of this workgroup; we talked about potential network flexibility benefits using a map; and we talked about legal implications regarding service standards. Finally, during the second meeting in December, we brainstormed on ways to quantify cost and benefit, we talked about the zone chart, and we proposed a survey be taken by all members to check our pulse and maximize our input before moving forward.

14:20 – 14:50 Review Survey Results

The survey results were sent to all members during the meeting and we covered every sheet. Participation in the survey was low at 27%. We received 11 responses covering 15 members out of a total of 56. It was noted that non-Postal representation might be “enough” and later confirmed that 38% of non-Postal members participated vs. only 5% of Postal members. The benefit scores were fairly evenly distributed around the center with an average of 4.6 and median of 5. The impact scores on the other hand were higher with an average of 7 and a median of 7.5. The investment scores were also high with an average and median of 7.

14:50 – 14:55 Next Steps

The survey results suggest that the perception from the industry is that this is a high effort, high cost, (for some) and a moderate benefit endeavor. The group was asked to provide feedback on the survey results and suggestions on how to move forward. Bob volunteered to go first and suggested:

While the benefits can be seen with the increased flexibility this would provide the USPS to optimize their network, the results of the survey will not provide the USPS/Industry ROI that would be needed to justify a recommendation to proceed with this project from the work group. With minimal input from the USPS side (1

response) it was noted that the changes to USPS systems would likely have the same or higher ratings than the industry for impact and investment. Based on this, the work group believes that while there are benefits to both the USPS and industry for this increased level of flexibility, the investment required for some legacy systems will be a significant barrier. Given the number of issues with existing USPS systems, it would be the recommendation of this work group that the USPS focus its resources on the stabilization of existing systems and this would provide more benefit to the USPS and industry than proceeding with this project. At some future point, if the USPS makes the decision to proceed with this project, there would need to be a significant lead time provided to the industry for implementation (a minimum of a 2 year notification). Ultimately if this project is going to happen, it will be the USPS making the decision to do so and mandating the change if they want the additional level of flexibility for their network.

Another member expressed his opinion which was, in short, that there would have to be an overwhelming need in order for this to make sense. Therefore, the proposal, which everyone on the call agreed to, was for the Postal and Industry leads to create a draft recommendation that aligned with the comments provided by Bob for the group to review at the next meeting which is scheduled for Monday, January 28th, 2013, at 3PM Eastern. Our last meeting, which is before MTAC week, is scheduled for Monday, February 11th, 2013, at 3PM Eastern. During that meeting we will have a final chance to edit the work group's recommendation.

14:55 – 15:00 Adjourn and Attendance Update

Action Required

List of action items in the format shown below.

Action item – owner – due date – status

- Write up a recommendation draft – Bob Schimek and Alexandra Robleto – **01/28/13** – Assigned

Parking Lot

List of topics to be discussed later, offline, or elsewhere so as to keep this Work Group's meeting on task.

From 12/17/12:

Could we combine all labeling lists if they were all 5-Digits?

From 11/20/12:

Should we consider labeling lists by mail class and mail shape instead of going to 5-Digits?

If we do this, would all labeling lists be transformed to 5-Digits?

From 11/13/12:

There was some discussion towards the end of the meeting regarding being able to be more targeted regarding where mail is entered into the system. For example if you have a 5-digit pallet that has all Carrier Route bundles on it and the 5-digit is not an FSS zone, instead of directing that pallet to the location of where the bundle sorting occurs (currently what Mail Direction file does), instead be able to take it directly to the SCF where it will only need a cross dock movement to get it to the DDU (this example assumes the bundle sorting operations are not co-located which happens in a number of facilities). In a way it is another scenario that is similar to the solution for FSS Facility vs. FSS Scheme pallets which allows FSS Scheme pallets to go directly to the FSS site rather than the bundle sorting site when they are different (this FSS scenario will be supported in the December update of the Mail Direction file). Given the Issue Statement and Desired Results, this topic falls outside the domain of Work Group 152. While an interesting idea, running with this could be a Work Group of its own.