

**Mailer Technology Advisory Council (MTAC)
Meeting Report
09/02/2014 1:30 PM - 2:30 PM**

WORK GROUP #164 (WG164) SESSION

AGENDA

1. Discussion on potential options for improving data provisioning
2. 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	Lisa Bowes	Lisa West
Ed Conrad	Nicket Phatek	Charley Howard
Bill Barcheck	Steve Krajeck	Amy Cradic
David Propst	Mark Rheaume	Bob Rosser
Tracy Sikes	Paula Stoskopf	James Parnello
Nancy Garrison	Martha Forrest	Dawn Mellas
Ken Young	Shawn Fakhari	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. The actual 8/26 notes will be distributed today (9/2) by Himesh.

Himesh presented a slide he prepared summarizing outstanding issues this group has addressed. Here is a summary of each and what was stated:

ISSUE #1: IV Timeline - Group wants to see, discuss and understand Informed Visibility schedule and plan

- IV is currently awaiting approval from management and schedule and timelines will be shared when the project has been approved.
- Himesh will share information when available

ISSUE #2: Pulse Overview & Timeline - Group would like more information on Pulse solution described by Steve Dearing at MTAC

- This sounded promising as a way to get visibility at least in the interim
- Himesh clarified that
 - Pulse is an internal dashboard at the USPS
 - Correct association is with IV platform
 - This data provisioning would be its early phase
 - What Steve presented at MTAC could be functional in 5-6 weeks and provides a promising "interim" solution we are focusing on in this work group
 - Question asked: "Can it help?"
 - Answer: Provides a promising "interim" solution we are looking for in this work group
- Himesh will be presenting more details at UG #4 meeting

ISSUE #3: Data latency follow-up - If SASP is getting data in near real time, why does the group still see

latencies and what is causing them?

- In meeting of 8/12, Chetan Patel presented information stating this data is captured in almost real time right now in SASP
- To be combined with Issue #1 above and #4 below into single issue as all are related

ISSUE #4: Data latency data mapping-Group needs 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”

- To be combined with Issues #1 and #3 above into single issue as all are related

ISSUE #5: Fees-Group warned that we must address potential fees being charged for any solution we propose

- Himesh will check with Memphis regarding this concern when appropriate
- Group was reminded again that EPF solution **does** have fees associated with it
- Group agrees this issue should be delayed until we are closer to proposing our solution/recommendation
- At this point we are not close enough to that point for the research to be meaningful

General discussion/progress:

Much discussion on EPF solution including:

- How does EPF know if the barcode is an IMb, IMcb or IMtb?
 - Currently EPF does not distinguish by barcode type since it is designed specifically for IMb
- Why can't our proposal be to send all IMcb and IMtb information captured, as it is captured to a particular MID?
 - System currently not designed for it and will require assessment
 - Inherent issue with distributing IMcb and IMtb data based on MID – data being provisioned to wrong party
- If this is not possible due to current functionality and/or complex data provisioning rules/systems, what can the USPS propose?
- Gaps exist today and this group exists to at least bridge some of them
- WG #164 needs to be focused on the best solution in terms of both USPS infrastructure until IV is fully implemented

Himesh asked for feedback form the group on the “Bundle Report” in PostalOne!

- Delivers actual scan data for top piece in bundle and “assumed” scans for all associated pieces
 - Bundles delivered to a delivery unit do not get scans which leaves gaps we are trying to eliminate
- Group pointed out that bundles are different than container and tray scans
 - Group needs to remember that EPF was already getting the piece data so no “bridge needed to be built
 - Bridge would need to be built for container and tray data

Additional key focus questions raised by USPS:

- What is the vision this group is trying to create? (In other words what do you want?)
 - Answer from group: The fastest way to get container and tray data provisioned
 - Knowing that containers and trays are at destination as soon as USPS operations has that information and before the piece level scans start to be provisioned
 - This data (container and tray) should be provisioned at the same or faster pace as the piece level data
- We learned two weeks ago that this information is ingested almost immediately so why the latencies?
 - Reconciliation with e-Docs
 - Reconciliation with data delegation platforms and protocols
 - Multiple “handoffs” between many and sometimes divergent USPS systems
- Industry asked: What is the value to the USPS of holding this data?
 - This seems to be the key to what this work group is trying to resolve
 - It was iterated that the USPS was not and did not plan to “hold” on to the data – it has to do we reconciling with “qualified” FS mailings.

- What would be the harm in provisioning this data as it is ingested
 - Skip reconciliation (just to provision) and go right to data delegation
 - Possibly start with a controlled pilot
 - Needs to be run past the “policy side of the house” at the USPS to see if possible
 - Industry has to understand that this does not preclude any issue resolution associated with reconciliation down the road
 - If data provisioned before reconciliation, it does not preclude that chargebacks and other “reconciliation events” may occur after the provisioning occurs (like with ACS)
 - Industry needs to trust the system to gain visibility
 - Industry pointed out that this would help with adoption of e-induction across industry which the USPS wants
 - Industry members on the group “get it”
 - All of this has to be controlled so the data is provisioned to the proper entity
 - Discipline and processes are necessary on both sides (USPS and Industry)
 - Cannot be ignored
 - Data is captured using intelligent devices that are not always available at all facilities and the USPS has to drive behavior to get scan percentages up
 - I would propose the same practices they used to get their scan percentages up for parcels and packages that has been so successful
 - Industry finds phased approach acceptable as long as progress is made quickly
 - Phase 1 could be containers and Phase 2 could be trays if necessary

Focus for next meeting (9/9):

- Group recommendation(s) for data delegation
 - Develop, capture and at least get framework in place
 - Policy questions cannot be resolved or answered here but they can be escalated
 - Make case for what this means in terms of benefits to all stakeholders
 - We feel there is good representation on this work group that can take back the recommendations to other groups (User Groups or Work Groups) and vet with them as appropriate

Any Other Business

- None
- Meeting adjourned