

**Mailer Technology Advisory Council (MTAC)  
Meeting Report  
08/26/2014 1:30 PM - 2:30 PM**

**WORK GROUP #164 (WG164) SESSION**

**AGENDA**

1. Review of meeting report from last session
2. Overview of EPF mechanism for ACS data (Lisa West)
3. Overview of IMb Tracing data provisioning mechanism (Amy Cradic)
4. AOB

**DISCUSSION POINTS**

The purpose of this work group's meetings is to provide an ongoing forum to facilitate communications between the Postal Service and users, define and review improvements in process/production functionality and address and resolve issues.

**Attendees (Those who signed in under name)**

Tony Allighen	Angelo Anagnostopoulos	Lisa West
Ed Conrad	Jody Dayton	Charley Howard
Bill Barcheck	Dave Meyers	Amy Cradic
David Propst	Mark Rheaume	Bob Rosser
Tracy Sikes	Paula Stoskopf	James Parnello
Nancy Garrison	Martha Forrest	Dawn Mellas
Ken Young	Kurt Ruppel	Paul Kovalakas
Chetan Patel	Judy Kalus	Karrera Guillory

**Issues Identified**

The report of the last meeting was discussed and with no noted changes, it was adopted as final.

Bill Barcheck acted as the meeting chair in Himesh's absence. He introduced Lisa West and Amy Cradic to the group.

**Lisa West presented information (in deck attached) the group had requested about the various Single Source ACS data delegation vehicles and the tradeoffs the industry agreed to in making the solutions work.**

- Process map prepared by Himesh was reviewed and explained
- Single Source ACS users agreed to take all data in exchange for changes
- Single Source ACS uses a direct delivery of the piece level changes as default which addressed questions from last meeting about Single Source ACS' "model" and a perceived lack of "discipline" with regard to the potential differences between the MID on piece vs. MID on pallet
  - Where would any interim solution be inserted is still a concern

**Amy Cradic presented process map for IMb Tracing data provisioning**

- Process map prepared by Himesh was reviewed and explained
- Amy provided great information about the process map and explained the protocols followed in terms of data provisioning from both a "time" (Every 15 minutes) factor and a "quantity of data" (1.5 mb) factor
- Group wants to understand what quality control measures are in place to ensure that all data is captured in the quantities expected to ensure that there are no "data voids"

**ISSUE: Group wants to see, discuss and understand Informed Visibility schedule and plan**

- Both an Informed Visibility diagram and time line should be prepared and presented
- Both will be valuable to provide direction and development of the “interim solutions this group will consider and propose
- Cannot achieve either without knowing the schedule for Informed Visibility being proposed

**ISSUE (Remaining from 8/12): In meeting of 8/12, Chetan Patel presented information that says this data is captured in almost real time right now in SASP**

- Group is still asking question: If this is the case, why do we see latencies and what is causing them?

**ISSUE (Remaining from 8/12): Group needs to draw a timeline w/PostalOne! and compare it to the data in the “field” to define which potential latency issues we will do a “deep dive” on**

- For each “map” we create we need to identify what data is captured, where, when and how frequently provisioned
- Evaluations can then be made regarding use of current portals vs. creation of new portal
- Some restated that EPF must be used even as a way to login and extract the data we are looking for
  - Himesh warned that the USPS must fully understand how this is set up internally to access container visibility
  - Process maps he will create and present will allow this group to review all three processes side by side, review them together and identify/resolve associated latencies
- Group emphasized the importance of making this solution accessible to all industry groups in the process (Mail Owner, MSP, service providers and all others in industry)
  - Delegation option and functionality must be fully functional as with IMb, Single Source ACS, etc.

**ISSUE(Remaining from 8/12): Group warned that we must address potential fees being charged for any solution we propose**

- Himesh will check with Memphis regarding this concern

**Any Other Business**

- None
- Meeting adjourned