

Informed Delivery APP MTAC Workgroup #174

Session 19

**Friday, February 19, 2016
12:00 p.m. – 1:00 p.m. EST**

- ❑ Review of Session 18
 - 14.0: Integration with Postal One
 - ◆ Issue Log reviewed last week and moved to back of deck
 - ◆ WG will extend to late May to finalize recommendations
 - Ongoing discussions with USPS PostalOne!, Presort Bureaus, Idealliance, etc.
 - ◆ Full IMb solution will resolve any issues with ACS, IMb tracing, secure destruction, etc.
 - Informed Delivery MIDs will continue to be available to support campaigns at a simpler level – still no impacts to ACS, etc.
 - Update on Suppression Survey
- ❑ Ongoing discussion
 - Subgroup Work Product – Feedback Loop
- ❑ Wrap up & Next steps

❑ Suppression Survey – only 19 responses

- Data is not readable as instructions weren't followed
 - Some respondents didn't use 1, 2, or 3 numbering options as directed
 - Some didn't put ranking numbers in Questions 2-4
- Working on new format with clearer instructions and assistive survey tools that will provide readable results



#14 COMPLETE
Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, January 29, 2016 10:02:56 AM
Last Modified: Friday, January 29, 2016 10:47:30 AM
Time Spent: 00:44:33

#2 COMPLETE
Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, January 29, 2016 7:52:08 AM
Last Modified: Friday, January 29, 2016 7:54:07 AM
Time Spent: 00:01:58

Response #14:

Question	Response
Q1: Currently, Informed Delivery mail pieces that are destined to the address of an enrolled consumer. Please indicate below whether or not you have a preference for a long term solution related to the display or suppression of images. If you have a preference, please continue with Questions 2-4, otherwise, skip to Q5. Note that no cost implications have been identified at this time.	I have a preference and have indicated it in the question(s) below
Q2: I think that all mail piece images should be shown to consumers - as programmed today. If you agree with this statement, categorize its importance to you as 1, 2, or 3. Please do not repeat numbers used above or below.	1
Q3: I think that Mailers should be given the choice to Opt-Out of having their mail piece images included in daily notifications. If you agree with this statement, categorize its importance to you as 1, 2, or 3. Please do not repeat numbers used above or below.	1
Q4: I think that all images should only be shown if Mailers Opt-In to having them displayed in daily notifications. If you agree with this statement, categorize its importance to you as 1, 2, or 3. Please do not repeat numbers used above.	1

Response #2:

Question	Response
Q1: Currently, Informed Delivery is set up to include images of the front/address side of all letter-sized mail pieces that are destined to the address of an enrolled consumer. Please indicate below whether or not you have a preference for a long term solution related to the display or suppression of images. If you have a preference, please continue with Questions 2-4, otherwise, skip to Q5. Note that no cost implications have been identified at this time.	I have a preference and have indicated it in the question(s) below
Q2: I think that all mail piece images should be shown to consumers - as programmed today. If you agree with this statement, categorize its importance to you as 1, 2, or 3.	Respondent skipped this question
Q3: I think that Mailers should be given the choice to Opt-Out of having their mail piece images included in daily notifications. If you agree with this statement, categorize its importance to you as 1, 2, or 3. Please do not repeat numbers used above or below.	2
Q4: I think that all images should only be shown if Mailers Opt-In to having them displayed in daily notifications. If you agree with this statement, categorize its importance to you as 1, 2, or 3. Please do not repeat numbers used above.	Respondent skipped this question

❑ Subgroup Work Product Review

- Section 2 – Feedback Loop – Short Term
 - ◆ Group reviewed subgroup work product in relation to Pre and Post Campaign data sharing
 - ◆ Reviewed proposed file formats and content
 - No additional recommendations made
 - ◆ Talked about proposed Customer Key that would allow for sharing of data without identification of enrolled users

- Section 3 – Feedback Loop – Long Term
 - ◆ Reviewed additional elements proposed for long term solution
 - ◆ Discussed overall concept of how campaign would be activated and the data elements required
 - ◆ Acknowledged outstanding issue of how Presort Bureaus would be able to support Mailer participation in campaigns
 - ◆ Acknowledged outstanding issue of ensuring that campaigns do not adversely impact ability for IMb tracking/tracing or ACS

- Subgroup Work Product Review – Cont'd
 - Section 3 – Feedback Loop – Long Term
 - ◆ Excerpt below...

Notes: need to consider when the file submission would be required. Preference would be to keep it in line with the existing submission timeline. Mail.dat triggers payment, etc. In theory, this would be suitable for a campaign as well. The campaign would begin once the mail is inducted.

The listing below shows the additional Post-Campaign data elements that the subgroup is proposing: This would be a data flow specific to Informed Delivery™ for mailers actively participating in campaigns.

- Consumer IP address
- Consumer Status: Ineligible, eligible but haven't signed up, signed up
- Geo-location of where click through was conducted
- Type of device (desktop or mobile, if mobile, android, iphone, etc.)
- Number of images in email and the Mailers position within the email (2nd part already in short term table)
- Dimensions and shape of image
- Number of mailpieces within the email that are Standard Mail vs. FCM, etc. Note: This would be derived from the inbound mailer file, not necessarily images.
- Mailers would like feedback on instances where the image is delivered on a different day than the actual mailpiece. Note: This could be derived potentially by a bundle scan of delayed mail. Reference: existing Beta test – Mailer subscribe to the bundle feed – like they would piece data, pallet data, etc. Another concept is using geo-fencing to determine when mail is delivered (another Beta test).

USPS would provide all elements needed so that Mailers can conduct analysis on their end. The architecture would need to be established up front to accomplish the last two bullets.



Wrap Up & Next Steps



All Friday meetings held via WebEx from 12:00 noon – 1:00 p.m. EST

- Weekly subgroup meetings held each Tuesday via WebEx from 12:00 noon – 1:00 p.m. EST

- Telecom Meeting Dates
- F2F Meeting Dates
- MTAC, USPS HQ/Washington DC
- NPF/MTAC, Nashville TN
- Subgroup Meeting Dates

2015						
Su	Mo	Tu	We	Th	Fr	Sa
					4	5
					11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30			

October 2015						
Su	Mo	Tu	We	Th	Fr	Sa
				1	2	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	31

November 2015						
Su	Mo	Tu	We	Th	Fr	Sa
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30					

December 2015						
Su	Mo	Tu	We	Th	Fr	Sa
		1	2	3	4	5
6	7	8	9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30	31		

January 2016						
Su	Mo	Tu	We	Th	Fr	Sa
					1	2
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20	21	22	23
24	25	26	27	28	29	30
31						

February 2016						
Su	Mo	Tu	We	Th	Fr	Sa
	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	8	9	10	11	12	13
14	15	16	17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24	25	26	27
28	29					

March 2016						
Su	Mo	Tu	We	Th	Fr	Sa
		1	2	3	4	5
6	7	8	9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30	31		

April						
Su	Mo	Tu	We	Th	Fr	Sa
					1	2
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20	21	22	23
24	25	26	27	28	29	30

May						
Su	Mo	Tu	We	Th	Fr	Sa
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30	31				



Subgroup Work Product Review and Wrap Up

Topic	Proposed Meeting Date	
Introduction of Subgroup Work Product	02/05/16	✓
Feedback Loop – Short Term	02/05/16	✓
Feedback Loop – Short Term / Long Term	02/12/16	✓
Feedback Loop – Long Term	02/19/16	
Response Rates	02/26/16	
Critical Success Factors	03/04/16	
	03/11/16	
	03/18/16	
	03/25/16	
Remaining weeks will be used for above items and to review PostalOne!, mail.dat, ACS impacts, etc.	04/01/16	
	04/08/16	
	04/15/16	
	04/22/16	
	04/29/16	
	05/06/16	
	05/13/16	
Resolution Document	05/13/16	
Resolution Document	05/20/16	



- ❑ Workgroup WebEx – Session 20
 - Friday, February 26, 12:00 noon EST
 - ◆ Sub Group WebEx – Session 16
 - Tuesday, Feb 23, 12:00 noon EST

- ❑ Planned content
 - Continue subgroup work product review
 - ◆ Response Rates
 - Update on Suppression survey



Historical Issue Log



Proposed Schedule

#	Issue	Proposed Meeting Date	
7.0	Consumer Pilot Selection Process	09/25/15	✓
8.0	Mailer Pilot Selection Process	09/25/15	✓
3.0	USPS and Industry Critical Success Factors	10/02/15	Subgroup
3.1	Impact on Response Rates	10/02/15	Subgroup
4.0	Timing / Content Discrepancies	10/09/15	✓
4.1	Data Reliability	10/09/15	✓
6.0	Data Security	10/16/15	✓
11.0	Feedback Loop	10/23/15	Subgroup
14.0	Integration with Postal One	10/30/15	✓
5.0	Identity Validation Process	11/06/15	✓
13.0	Mail Moment Impact	11/17/15	✓
12.0	Suppression of Images	12/04/15	✓
12.1	Suppression of Images	12/04/15	✓
12.2	Suppression functionality for mail pieces	12/04/15	✓
9.0	Flats Participation	12/11/15	✓
2.0	Do NOT Mail	12/18/15	✓
1.0	Postal Inspection Service - Surveillance Program/Mail Covers	01/08/16	✓
15.0	Non-Automation Mail	01/12/16	✓
10.0	Change of Address Process	01/22/16	✓

❑ Issue 3.0: USPS and Industry Critical Success Factors

- CSF's were reviewed by the group on 10/2 and 10/9
- Additional factors will be added as necessary
- A sub-group is being established to provide more input on what would be necessary to deem the test result CSF's statistically valid
 - ◆ Concerns with MID level being insufficient for testing (as compared to a sequence level within a MID)

❑ Issue 3.1: Impact on Response Rates

- This pilot program will provide input on response rates based on more registered users and more mailer interactivity tests
- Consider having saturation mailers monitor their response rates in the same ZIP Code locations to see if there is any impact

❑ Issue 4.0: Timing / Content Discrepancies

- USPS will be capturing and measuring customer issues/concerns to help determine the scope of this issue, understand the root cause of these discrepancies, and help determine what can be done to minimize

❑ Issue 4.1: Data Reliability

- In addition to the item mentioned above, WG members can provide more examples of instances where 919 scans were received but the mail piece was reported as undelivered

❑ Issue 6.0: Data Security

- Information was provided on the security enhancements that the USPS has taken since September 2015, including links to updated handbooks that provide detailed information
- WG members are welcome to submit any additional key items after reviewing the material provided/referenced

❑ Issue 11.0: Feedback Loop

- The original question posed was whether or not consumers would be able to “refuse” their images in their email and, ultimately, stop the mail piece from being delivered
- The discussion progressed further, largely broken into two categories and two sub-categories
 - ◆ Consumer facing – customer service and preferences
 - ◆ Mailer facing – operational and marketing

□ Issue 11.0: Feedback Loop

● Consumer Facing:

- ◆ Blocking images is not in the pilot program. Based on feedback during the meeting, this practice is not generally recommended by the industry.
- ◆ WG members did suggest that there could be action buttons and/or indicators of a “trusted provider” within the email.
 - It was suggested that this could be a way that consumers could report issues to the USPIS.

● Mailer Facing:

- ◆ WG members did feel that data provided back to mailers should include the type of enrollment and the time of delivery, to allow additional digital marketing efforts. This could be done through APIs.
- ◆ The WG had additional discussion on the “Ideal Feedback Loop” on 10/30/15. Discussed the concept of the connected mailbox and the potential benefits to consumers, potential revenue for the USPS, and concerns for mailers in relation to “refusing” mail.
- ◆ Team still needs to think about the Ideal Feedback Loop; initially described as a data transaction, perhaps similar to the IMb tracing capability, indicating the delivery point barcode, date and time of the email delivery.
 - **Additional detailed discussion was held on 11/6. The sub-group will be tasked with capturing the list of feedback loop items desired.**

❑ Issue 14.0: Integration with Postal One

- While not precisely speaking to the “when” such an effort might take place, Angelo noted that it would be likely be included in one of the two major releases scheduled each year.
- Mail.dat & Mail.xml are a given, however, it is not clear how the mail supply chain could benefit from a separate file submission. Workgroup participants were asked to think about that and share any suggestions.
- The question was asked about how the USPS will tie the images or URLs to the mailpiece. Tactically speaking, PostalOne is driven by the job id, so how is the person who didn’t submit the Mail.dat to PostalOne going to know how to tie it to that mailing?
- **The team will want to revisit this discussion when USPS is able to talk about how they imagine creating this connection (which should be in January 2016).** During the pilot, information will largely be managed by email and the MID will be used to connect the dots. Longer term the USPS imagined being able to apply images based on the IMb sequence number range.

❑ Issue 5.0: Identity Validation Process

- Reviewed existing process where USPS will use an Equifax Q&A process for consumers to prove their identity
- A validation letter may be sent as well
 - ◆ Carrie is working on the SOP to address what would happen if an account was set up fraudulently
 - ◆ USPS should use best practices based on expertise in this area and understand that these practices will change going forward
- One additional concern is how to manage minors
 - ◆ Minors can currently go to the mailbox and get mail, however, will they be able to see the emails?
 - There is a rule on this. USPS has policies in place that are stated in online User Agreements that prohibit minors (under 18) from registering. They would also have to pass the Equifax questions.

❑ Issue 13.0: Mail Moment

- Original questions posed:
 - ◆ Will this type of digital imagery have a positive or negative impact on the Mail Moment?
 - ◆ Will there be a loss of value to hardcopy mail?
- Guest speaker – Vicki Stephen, Director Mailing Services
 - ◆ Provided a presentation with data that supports an increased value vs. a loss of value
 - Including studies on neuroscience, etc.
 - ◆ The pilot program will help validate or negate this assumption

❑ Issue 12.0: Suppression of Images

- Questions/comments posed
 - ◆ Some mailers have expressed an interest to have images suppressed.
 - Need to discuss the implications of this and how it would be implemented.
 - ◆ As a follow-up to this, concern on images of envelopes which contain credit cards - these envelopes are commonly plain white -- what is the security to make sure these images cannot be stolen to maintain the mailbox security.
- Asking team to document pros/cons/use cases
 - ◆ From both a customer and mailer perspective
 - Will conduct a WG vote to present with final resolution document

Example	Pros	Cons	Use Cases
Collection Notices	Mailer has confirmation that the consumer opened an email with the image of a mailpiece.	Potential PII breach. During roll out, information is inconsistent across the country.	Item is misaddressed image would go to wrong person, breaching PII. The physical mailpiece would also be given to the wrong person in this case.
Advertising Mail	Multiple touch points, physical and digital	Lose impulsivity and textual impact of mail	Consumer sees B&W image, so doesn't have any urgency to get to actual mailpiece
Embossed credit card number on outside of envelope.		Potential PII breach. If mailpiece image goes to wrong consumer, privacy issues are a concern.	Embossed credit card in an envelope could be pressed against the roller during mail processing such that the numbers are imprinted on the envelope.



Examples

Example	Pros	Cons	Use Cases
Payroll Checks			
Tax refunds			
Subpoena's			
Red Light Tickets			
Certified Mail	Consumers can see image in advance.		Consumer sees an image of their Certified Mailpiece and they know that they have a signature item to pick up at the post office. Saving them time and adding convenience to their daily tasks.
Certified Mail	Mailer has confirmation that the consumer opened an email with the image of a mailpiece.		Mailer sends a Certified item to a consumer. Consumer doesn't pick up item, however, mailer has documentation that the email was opened.



Examples

Example	Pros	Cons	Use Cases
High Dollar Amount Coupons			
CC Convenience Checks	Consumers could see information in advance and take action Consumer could take immediate action to get them out of their mailbox	Consumer could ignore it	Not necessarily just related to this topic.
Mailings from CC companies with their return address		Fraud, theft	I know that AmExp cards come from XX address and I can hack into people's email and see who has a credit card in their mail today. Can we quantify the risk? Can we mitigate the risk without the showing the return address?

❑ Issue 12.0: Suppression of Images

- Some members felt strongly that the Digital delivery of Mailpiece Images to consumers ought to fundamentally be an Opt-In program for business mailers. Business Mailers who pay postage to the USPS for delivery of that physical piece are paying for that service alone.
- Identified several instances of how image suppression might be used to eliminate risks associated with fraud, particularly PII; concerns related to collection notices or Certified Mail; implications to payroll checks, tax refunds, subpoena's, red light tickets or convenience checks (negotiable blank checks sent by credit card companies)
- Could this be a legal issue since mailers are paying for a physical piece to be delivered and nothing else, a digital image is not what they paid for?

❑ Issue 12.0: Suppression of Images

- Technical solution to suppress would be based on Opt-In vs. Opt-Out (for mailers) so compiling a solution may not be feasible for the group
 - ◆ Example would be that STID could be used like it is for other extra services
- Do we need to worry about a future version where Mailer could not send the MP, but just an image with a hardcopy as just backup in some instances?
 - ◆ This would have to be based on USPS policy where images are not derived by a hardcopy mailpiece
- In an opt-in world, question was raised about what it would be like for the consumer, it was suggested that they would adapt to the # of images in the daily email not matching what is in their physical mailbox

❑ Issue 9.0: Flats Participation

- Carrie provided overview of test model and time period
 - ◆ Flats testing can commence in early February 2016
- Want visibility for all flats, including bundles that aren't broken down and processed on equipment
 - ◆ Discussed using a subtractive scanning process; suggested there would be benefits to coordinate with that program, which is being managed by Himesh Patel.
- USPS is still looking for additional flat mail test candidates

- ❑ Issue 1.0 - Postal Inspection Service - Surveillance Program/Mail Covers
 - Recommendation from original issue statement was that USPIS could consider using images to improve the effectiveness of this program
 - ◆ The USPIS agreed that this might complement the covers program, however, there are no changes in the works
 - Maybe the daily notification email could have some type of action button that would allow a subscriber to report an issue
 - Need to keep USPS Public Relations in the mix so they can respond to any type of media inquiries

❑ Issue 15.0 – Non-Automation Mail

- The current logic of showing images for automated letter mail and then a “statement” for flats seems confusing
 - ◆ Especially when the two together don’t match the number of mailpieces that are delivered in a day
 - ◆ Need to add a clarifying statement on the daily notification email (DNE) that not all images are included and that not all mailpieces may be delivered on the same day as the image
- Could possibly include Mailer information in the future, if taken from the existing files submitted prior to mailing
 - ◆ Need to determine if bundle scans from flats (being tested now) will be included in the DNE’s too
 - ◆ Concern that mailer images not included could result in their mailings getting less attention (EDDM)
- Overall concern with consumers possibly being confused with not getting all images

Subject: FW: Informed Delivery Daily Digest
Attachments:  ATT00001.txt (960 B)

Today's Deliveries 12/21/2015

The information below contains images of the letter-sized mail you'll be receiving today.* Look for opportunities to interact with your mail where mailer provided content is available!

[Go to your Informed Delivery Mailbox](#)

 *A mailpiece for which we do not currently have an image is included in today's mail.*



❑ Issue 10.0 Change of Address Process

- Consider integrating automation for Hold Mail and PFS
 - ◆ Example: equipment could hold out mail for carrier; customer could have ability to pick a piece out and expedite delivery
- Integrate the COA process with USPS.com user profile.
 - ◆ Participants update their address manually at this time
 - ◆ Consider COA list cross-reference in the interim
- Finalize SOP for remaining gap for customers who don't file a change of address
 - ◆ Explore what else can be done to ensure that Informed Delivery participants do not get mail that doesn't belong to them.
 - ◆ Privacy is critical to the credibility of the Informed Delivery program. We need to look at both current privacy policies and near term future privacy policies.

- ❑ Issue 10.0 Change of Address Process
 - USPS should consider including individual names in the matching logic
 - USPS could assign participants a “.post” address
 - ◆ Example: JaneDoe@US.post as a way to link the email address & the physical address to an individual
 - Provide ‘ID’ participants with a simple sort of ACS notice
 - ◆ Example: we attempted to deliver mail but couldn’t for this reason; “We think you moved and didn’t file a COA”
 - Consider a solution at the carrier level
 - ◆ The carrier is aware for example, that after a certain number of days, that the mail has not been collected
 - ◆ Ultimately the mail either follows the resident or it gets returned to the sender – based on the carrier action

- ❑ Issue 14.0: Integration with PostalOne!
 - Long term solution is currently being devised
 - ◆ Will support Mailer campaigns for interactive content
 - ◆ Plan is for API feed between PostalOne! and Informed Delivery™
 - Need to be cognizant of a solution that works for all in the supply chain (mailer, MSP, creative/design, presort bureau, etc.)
 - Need ability to apply campaigns by IMb, not just MID
 - ◆ Applying by MID only creates issues with data sharing for ACS, IMb tracing, and secure destruction
 - Need to engage PostalOne! USPS team to flesh out process flows for all possible scenarios
 - ◆ Who creates mail, who prints mail, who barcodes mail, who submits mail, who submits mail.dat file, whose MID is used, how API data gets back to the mailer, etc.
 - Consider existing solution and Opt-Out/Opt-In impacts

- ❑ Issue 14.0: Integration with PostalOne!
 - Work with NAPM on issues and flows
 - Work with PostalOne! on issues and flows
 - ◆ USPS, Idealliance, etc.
 - Present to smaller subset of WG and then full WG

- ❑ Work on this issue will result in Workgroup Extension
 - Proposing 2 additional months – to end of May 2016