

Minutes for Workgroup #174 – Informed Delivery APP

Session 26: 12:00 noon – 1:00 p.m. EST WebEx

Jody opened up the meeting & asked if there were any questions or comments from previous discussions or new items (Carrie was absent this week). Jody directed the workgroup to focus on the final recommendations for the resolution document. We are working towards the May 20th deadline. Jody suggested our energy will be more productive focused on the finalization of the recommendation rather than conducting another survey. A recommendation was made to the group to set aside the newest survey that was suggested due to strenuous objections to digital content by Steve from AccuZIP. As with all other issues discussed, Steve's comments/concerns will be included as part of the resolution statement. There were no objections to this proposal.

Randy asked about the layout from a February workgroup discussion regarding the file exchange. The layout is a part of the sub-workgroup product. Yes, it was discussed the last couple of weeks. The work product itself is not in the notes on RIBBS; however, the discussion is documented. Later in the meeting Jody mentioned that the review of the PostalOne! & alternate file is on our next steps and we will take a deeper dive next week & if desired, we can revisit the layout then. Jody reminded the group that the sub-workgroup is finishing up its product so the final document will still be published.

- Jody pulled up the resolution document and started to talk through the issues from the Issue log. We deferred most of the discussion on issue 3 re: response rates til the final sub-workgroup product is completed. We did add the update that early on the workgroup recommended that the MID level was inadequate and the USPS either added the sequence number level or is doing so real soon.
- With regard to issue 3.1 (response rates) the group updated the resolution document to say: no results to share yet. Number of registered users significantly lagged due to production issues, too premature for info to be available. USPS continue to share open/read rates/response rates > updates to MTAC after WG closes & program is nationwide.
- We agreed to maintain the recommendation that saturation mailers keep a close eye on their response rates & share that information on a high level with USPS & MTAC.
- Timing & Content Discrepancies: Sam raised the question as to how is the Informed Delivery program framed for the consumer. Roger expressed concern about the disclaimer to consumers as well. We discussed that in detail at a previous meeting. Action item: to call out that specific language/disclaimer to consumer. The concern that Informed Delivery creates customer expectations – increases calls to USPS & possibly to business is anecdotally validated with snowstorm in VA – Jessica calling for her mail. As an 18 month pilot participant, and former letter carrier, Lee Garvey says anyone who has ever gotten a misdirected /misdelayed piece of mail understands and will adjust.
- Issue 4 on Data Reliability – homework – review the notes – & clarify what is the WG recommending?

- ❑ Issue 6 : Data Security. Recommend USPS CISO (Randy Miskanic)– conduct security review on pilot protocols/rollout protocols & report back to MTAC re: compliance so that MTAC members can share with their security depts. & ensure all are in sync (prior to participation)
 - WG members were invited to review the notes & advise of any additional recommendations on security.

- ❑ WG suggested adding a new issue: Carrier Level UAA. In other words Good as Addressed, despite the fact that the mailpiece was not delivered. Sharon reminded the group that early on, we discussed the Good as Addressed issue. Action item: review notes to find that discussion & finalize.

We skipped /jumped into a discussion on the Identity Validation Process (Issue 5). Two points, one new, one refresh. Sharon suggested that the existing identity validation process ought to be extended to an ongoing validation, timing tbd – monthly, weekly or more frequently. Dylan pointed out that sign-up is on individual level but the Informed Delivery program is picking up mailpieces at the piece level and delivering the digital image at the Delivery Point level. Highlighting the gap (& risks associated with the gap).

Sam asked if we have any feedback, measurements on the impact to Do Not Mail lists? Jody advised there is no report from the DMA yet. When asked, USPS indicates that there is no or minimal negative feedback from citizens engaged in the pilot program.

- Reviewed existing process where USPS will use an Equifax Q&A process for consumers to prove their identity Need routine/automated ongoing validation.
- A validation letter may be sent as well we understand USPS is integrating the letter validation process from COA / restate as recommendation ?

We jumped to the suppression of images issue (#12) to discuss the matter of Opt-In/Opt-Out . We agreed that the workgroup members strongly recommended Mailers Opt-In to Informed Delivery program in order to mitigate operational and financial risk associated with program participation. The vote conducted in first survey led us to conclusion that business needs an option to choose participation in Informed Delivery. The USPS ought to maintain capability for Opt-in on both MID level and individual piece level. Mailer preference would execute on MID or Individual level.

An Opt-in approach makes image suppression capability irrelevant. If USPS decides to proceed with Opt-Out approach, Mailers will need robust image suppression on both MID & individual level.
New Issue. How would mailer validate accurate execution ? Consequences may fall on private sector for errors of this nature... what / how could USPS resolve / communication / legal / financial ???

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. Need to discuss this item in further detail.

A workgroup member raised the concern, again, that the existence of the Informed Delivery program could be a legal issue since mailers are paying the USPS for a physical piece to be delivered and nothing else, a digital image is not what they paid for. Need to make sure this is clear to both workgroup members and nonmembers.