

Meeting Minutes - MTAC Workgroup 170

12/02/2015

Certificate of Mailing

Today's meeting was intended to be Workgroup 170 final close out meeting. David Marinelli thanked everyone for their participation in the workgroup. The workgroup finalized their recommendations and provided to the Postal Service for their response. There were a few questions that needed clarification that we worked with Postal on prior to today's presentation. Karen Key and Suzanne Newman provided the overview of the workgroup's recommendations and Postal Service's responses;

1. Target publication- December 24, 2015. It was recommended that the information be shared with Industry via Industry Alert & DMM Advisory.
2. Central approval of all facsimile to HQ – communicated in Postal Bulletin and DMM
3. Clarification on format to “Nearly Identical”
4. Sequential page numbering (page 1 of xx , 2 of xx)

Long Term Recommendations – COM form changes (notes - See presentation)

Postal Service is mandating the use of the new forms, either Postal or approved facsimiles by June 2, 2017 – 18 months from today. –mailer need to make changes and be compliant within that time frame. Within the next 6 months the Postal Service will advise if the automation tool is going to be developed and available. The Postal Service is waiting for rate quote from development to determine feasibility. If automation option is used a barcode will be required. Gary Reblin has stated that he is open to considering tiered pricing, cautions that all rates must be approved by the PRC. He has been clear that pricing decisions are beyond his control. Facsimile approved a National level – Effective date January 17, 2016, which aligns with DMM publishing of Competitive Price change. The approval system will include sending an electronic watermark providing evidence of approval of facsimile. Able to start prior to 1/17/2016, Karen Key to provide e-mail address to send forms. (**Contact Karen for e-mail address**)

When asked about response time expectations, Postal advised that requester would receive updates. It was highly encouraged that everyone uses the process, existing facsimiles that are in use so that companies would have the evidence that the form was approved in court if needed. Mailers/Companies are expected to retain the approved form as evidence, the designated BME will be sent a copy, and however they are not required to maintain /retain copies.

Long Term Recommendations – General

There was considerable discussion on the Postal Service's response to the 3 days to correct mistakes, especially in light of the last statement on slide presentation, “It will be at the sole discretion of the USPS to determine if the missed page was a USPS error and if it can /will be postmarked the next business day “Postal Service is stating that they need to ensure that they infact did miss the page.” It was pointed out that there would be no other reason for a mailer to bring the page back to the Postal Service for correction. Mailer asked about illegible stamps, date not legible. Karen committed to review standard operation procedure with all BME /clerks. Sharon made a recommendation to mailers to ensure they escalate any concerns to District Managers, BME Managers in order to raise awareness & resolve these problems. Continue to

Meeting Minutes - MTAC Workgroup 170

12/02/2015

put pressure on local level to ensure training is provided to all clerks. Karen acknowledged that they are emphasizing the importance through training of all Postal employees.

Automation Proposal discussion (see presentation for detail)

Next Steps

Issuing SOP to BME's & DMU's – target date 1/17/2016

COM Tool

❖ Still working to determine if tool will be developed

Sample of “Dual Stamper “

When this was unveiled for the first time to the work-group, visual included on the last slide of presentation, there was concern expressed as the appearance could cause confusion and questions related to the actual mailing date. The Postal Service proposed a round robin with the new date of “re-issue” for the date it was corrected and using the same stamp markings next to that with original date of mailing. The concern is that courts could see 2 different types of stamps. This will raise issues and potentially increase in demand for Postal to provide affidavit explaining the reasoning for the dual stamp. Postal stated that legal was opposed to back-dating using the Round Robin Stamp. We have requested Postal to revisit this stamp, requested the Original Date as the Round Robin and eliminating the second marking altogether and have re-iterated that the only reason for requesting a page to be stamped is to correct the error from original mailing.

- Postal has agreed to speak to legal and will get back to David on the matter.