

## Minutes for Workgroup #174 – Informed Delivery APP

Session 32: 12:00 noon – 1:00 p.m. EST WebEx

Reviewed Session 31. This last working session of MTAC WG 174 was spent finalizing the Resolution Statement. Several emails were submitted from 5 WG members for this round of edits/commentary between 5/13 and 5/20. They are provided below.

5/13/2016: I'm still not following the page 3 text in regard to monetization. My thinking is that with a Mailer Opt-Out approach, there is no price implication to mailers. The current delivery method and price remains as it is today outside of the pilot areas. I.e. postage pays for physical delivery only.

*Response: WG co-chairs integrated some comments, clarified others.*

5/13/2016: I believe the pricing strategy language for an "Opt-Out" approach was written based on the assumption that the Postal Service would not be charging for b&w image scans for letter shaped mail for those mailers that allow their mail to be included in the Informed Delivery program (i.e. do not actively opt-out). Since flats mailers can only participate in the program by providing an image for the USPS to link to the piece scan, to "be fair to flats mailers" (i.e. equal treatment as letter mailers) it was suggested that the Postal Service not charge for linking a supplied image for those flats mailers that do not chose to opt-out. I have not been able to participate in all of the WG calls, so I may have missed a discussion in which the group decided to recommend charging for b&w scans for letter mailers that do not opt-out of the program??

*Response: WG co-chairs integrated some comments, clarified others.*

5/16: Some minor word changes to help clarify item 7. A digital materials solution was outlined for Mail.dat file users with an expected launch date of January 2017. An alternative for non-Mail.dat users (such as First-Class Continuous Mailers), is defined and will be developed further. This can also be used as a contingency approach for PostalOne! outages. Mail.xml still needs to be updated. Ability to apply Ride-Along Color Image campaigns and campaigns with URL links by IMb, not just MID. Action Taken: Additional content now enabled by IMb. Mail.dat capability will be effective Jan 2017.

*Response: WG co-chairs integrated comments.*

5/16: I have attached some language that might be useful for the Do Not Mail issue. The USPS isn't allowed to "lobby" but they are allowed to educate policy makers and others – hopefully this language strikes the appropriate tone.

*Response: WG co-chairs integrated comments.*

5/17: Some quick comments on the Resolution Skeleton:

- Re: #7/Digital Materials (which should be #4 – there is a gap in the numbering) and the third bullet...the STID is to provide an on-piece “solution” for what? To trigger Opt-In or Opt-Out? If so, we should specify that. If it’s intended for something else, we should specify what that is.
- Re: #9/COAs...I think we should move up 7th bullet to the second bullet position as this seems to be a major concern. I would also modify the first sentence in that bullet as, “Explore what else can be done to ensure that Informed Delivery participants who move and do not file a COA notice, do not get images of mail that doesn’t belong to them. Personally I think a carrier solution is very prone to problems and wouldn’t want to rely on carriers noticing changes, (exacerbated by roommates moving in and out). But it was recommended and we’re saying to “consider” such a solution, so I guess its ok. Perhaps add this as a sub bullet. I would add another sub bullet suggesting that the USPS look to subscribe to 3rd party services of proprietary COAs to supplement the COAs reported directly to the USPS.

*Response: WG co-chairs integrated some comments, clarified others.*

5/19: I read through the revisions and good with all. At the bottom of Page 2 in the section discussing monetization, I suggest that Recommendation bullet be added as you have in other sections. The recommendation could simple be: “USPS should develop a monetization strategy”. With this recommendation added, I count a total of 29 Recommendations. Wendy previously suggested that we highlight a few (3 or 4) of the highest priority recommendations. I totally agree with this suggestion – will this be discussed during tomorrow’s call? If this has already been done (I apologize, I have not made every call) the highest priority recommendations should be listed on Page 1.

*Response: WG co-chairs integrated some comments, clarified that some recommendations were consolidate which is why the numbers don’t match up.*

Additional commentary and/or edits were entered into the working draft document as appropriate. The final version of the document will be sent out for review prior to being sent to Steve and Gary for viewing and approval before being posted.

**Additional comments from 5 WG members after the 5/20 revision have been captured here.**

5/23/2016: Is there some recommendation we need to consider for impact to mailer/customer call centers from questions/concerns from the end-customer? How will we measure/identify how this program is impacting mailers from end-customers looking for the physical mail that doesn’t end up in their mailbox for some reason? What can we do to mitigate this with end-customers? I would expect that the USPS should ensure that training/information is provided to end-customers about this possibility and to know when to contact them about concerns. Then the USPS also needs to have a process in place to investigate and help resolve these types of concerns. Mailers/customers will need to also establish something similar to measure this.

*Response: WG chairs suggested this was covered in the current draft document. If you feel like these concerns are not sufficiently articulated, please let me know and we will add verbiage as needed.*

Requested Follow Up for Document:

- The USPS should ensure they are tracking and investigating customer complaints to identify root cause and work to mitigate systemic discrepancy issues. This information should be periodically reported out to mailers for their review and alignment.
- Mailers should consider including the tracking of customer mail discrepancy issues within their call centers, to identify any potential delivery issues based on this customer information.
- The USPS should also include detailed information to end-customers on whom to call within the USPS if they are unclear of a delivery/discrepancy problem.

*Response: bullet 1 is being covered today. Bullet 2 is certainly an option that all mailers can implement. Bullet 3 is covered in the document already.*

5/26/16: Based on the document provided, it appears we are suggesting an Opt-out approach for business mailers. Was that the consensus from the survey completed or was that decision made from additional follow up? Also, do we need to make more detail recommendations on the type of studies needed to determine impact on mail volume? Such as studies showing impact on Standard Flats, First Class Letters, etc. Perhaps that is details somewhere in the doc and I just missed it.

*Response: we got to this position through reasoning/discussion. While we as the private sector recognize the importance of "opt-in" trends, the group recognized that the more mail that is represented in the email preview (and/or dashboard) the more valuable from the "Informed Delivery consumer" perspective. The survey conducted directionally indicated the need to offer either an opt-in or an opt-out for business mailers, however, the WG members seemed to agree that the survey wasn't scientifically representative and that a representative survey ought to be taken if the USPS wants a survey to support the policy decision. Discussed how to possibly measure, design & conduct studies on the potential unintended consequence of accelerating a decline in hard copy mail volume.*

5/26/2016: Regarding tracking unintended consequences, such as a decline in "mail" volume.... I had mentioned a more insidious unintended consequence a number of times early on with this workgroup, and before this work group with Gary R and Jim C. directly. And, it simply is not a so much decline in mail volume but a decrease in catalog print volumes, which does not necessarily translate to a decline in mail volume.

For example; marketers may decide that linking to a website via the informed delivery does not require having a 64 page catalog, because the same effect can be had with a 12 page catalog, OR can be accomplished by sending 6x9 postcard. Ah-ha... USPS say's no mail volume decline with this, .....HOWEVER the USPS's most important trade-partners/mail-providers in the supply chain, the standard Flats printers, will be significantly impacted financially. This form of diversion cannot occur.

*Response: WG co-chairs stated that this could be inevitable. Agreed that USPS ought to measure this, as should Mailers, Mail Service Providers etc. Asked for suggestions on how to mitigate the risk.*

5/26/16 3:34 PM: Provided input on how studies mentioned above could be categorized. (Member provided a list of classes and types of mail and types of images/campaigns.)

Mail class/category/image type/add ons. Results could be presented at each level (i.e. just by class, then by class and category, and then the final level). As pointed out, page count could also be impacted so maybe not only measuring piece count but also total mail weight (or something to that affect).

*Response: added suggested categorization of studies to Appendix D, Response Rates. Updated language in document to clarify not just piece count but mail weight (and impact to revenue).*

5/26/16: The message is for the USPS to REALLY think about unintended consequences. USPS will be the casual-factor in this very ugly outcome, that I described, for entire industry, including the USPS. Rather than have a link to a website through informed delivery, the USPS should rather ardently pursue another venue. There is another way, a more positive and direct way to literally, digitally, in a mobile way to engage the printed page. Leave informed delivery be just that simple... no links to websites. Instead, have another USPS app a "universal commerce app" that engages commerce/website at the item level scanned from the printed piece that was delivered in the mailbox. Thereby, truly enhancing the "mail & mobile moment" and the value of hardcopy marketing. Pursuing a digital engagement directly with the printed mail piece/promotions will work to drive mail volume growth in all aspects and work to grow print volume ...this will enhance the value of marketing mail.

*Response: as this specific solution was not vetted during the active WG, it will be added in the minutes to ensure that the idea is captured.*

5/27/2016: Suggested some minor edit changes on pages 5 and 8 in the attached document (indicated in red type). On page 8, my assumption was that all of the bullets were intended to be a subset of the leading sentence which is why I reworded/ reformatted it as I did. If this is not the intention, the first and second bullets in your document should be combined into one sentence.

*Response: document was updated to reflect these edits.*

5/31/2016: A few points of clarification/comments: On Page 4 Under 'Identity Validation Process' there is section "Action Taken" which discusses the USPS now sending a letter to a newly registered individual. After that there are 5 bullet points. I just want confirm these 5 bullet points are recommendations and not part of the action taken by the USPS.

Page 5- In the first example under Monetization the first bullet point recommends a 'consumer pricing strategy be implemented'. So I am clear is the consumer pricing strategy recommending there be a charge for consumers to participate?

Page 7-under Reliability: "This information should be periodically shared with mailers for their review and alignment". Do we want to define periodically? If a user group is formed this certainly can be discussed at those meetings. If not how often would the industry want an update?-during new product focus areas at MTAC?

Page 12-under Mailer Participation and Results-Impact on Mail Volume-should we also include monitoring to the extent possible of migration in piece size and/or shape. Will the ability for mail owners to add URL to the electronic image change the hard copy mail piece. Will a flat mailer move to

letter size or a envelope be changed to a self-mailer. Volumes may stay the same(since hard copy must remain in the mail) but is there a possibility that revenue declines due to changes in mail piece size?

*Response: clarified that first item was correct, updated the statement on Page 5 to further clarify the position, clarified a quarterly ID meeting if a user group is not formed, added statements on Page 12 to clarify that size, shape, and/or number of pages (weight) should be considered.*

Carrie and Jody will work on setting up the MTAC ID WebEx, to be held prior to the July meeting at HQ. Carrie and Jody closed with thanking everyone for their time and input for the past 8 months, including the main WG and the sub-workgroup.