

Meeting Title:	MTAC PTR eVS User Group Meeting		
Meeting Objective(s):	Monthly meeting with Industry		
Date:	4/20/2016	Time:	4:00 – 5:00 pm ET
Location:	WebEx/Juliaann's Conference Room		
Attendees:	Alvin Serrano, Bryan Buri, Charlie Johnston, Crystal Stefanko, D Kennedy, Dennis Fehnel, DeWitt Crawford, Doug Ferguson, Ed Wanta, Gary Rogan, Henry Chau, Jaclyn Tubbin, Jim Wilson, Joe Mallozzi, John Medeiros, John P, Juliaann Hess, Mark Riffey, Oscar Vazquez, Paul Kovelakas, Randy Randall, Richard Porras, Sharon Harrison, Vicky Dansereau, Wendy Smith, Vicki Bosch, Maura Lowell, Paige Eckard		

Agenda Item	Topic	Minutes
1.	Objective 1: Agreed on Simplified list of Validations	<p>Address Quality</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed validations to be assessed are AAN1, A1M1, A1, AACC, and AAM3. The DPV footnotes are used rather than the return code delineators (Y, N, D, S) because they are more granular and are used in the PTR system code. <p>DPV Footnote – AACC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Industry is not in favor of keeping this AACC. The data says about 2% of addresses in the country could fall into AACC. USPS is revisiting logic used for the AQ conditions. In this situation, the AACC would represent when a customer may have apartment or suite information in the address that the USPS database does not agree with. This is described as the "S" (for street) record. AACC could occur when there is a set of unit addresses for that level. USPS is looking to see when the input generates an AACC response to see the frequency that this occurs. A second test will be run on the address by dropping the apartment or suite number and compare if the secondary information is provided. User group 5 also discusses address quality, and one suggestion from that was that there needs to be another return code to split out the DPV S events. There is a condition where USPS does not need secondary information but mailers are providing it anyways. The USPS DPV return codes to industry are Y, N, S, and D. These were requested by industry to tell them whether the address was valid or not and what might be wrong with it. For AACCs there are instances where USPS gets returns that are exact matches with the proper prefix, street name suffix, and resolved to an 11 digit ZIP. Packages are held to a different standard than letters and flats because of the difference in how they are handled. When USPS does not have the appropriate apartment information, then the package cannot be properly delivered, providing customers with a negative experience.

Agenda Item	Topic	Minutes
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Per W. Smith, there are parcel orders from promotional pieces that are delivered under return codes. • Industry does not have a way to identify the unique addresses from a package versus flat mail because the address provided by the customer is the same for both pieces. This information could be found through the address matching software. <p>DPV Footnotes – AAN1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Industry is concerned about the scenario where the delivery address is residential and there is no way for them to obtain secondary information from USPS due to privacy issues. At this point, Industry feels the only option for mailers is to pay the 20 cent fee. • Industry has no way to know if an address requires secondary information or not. • For some apartment building, there are cases where the Postal carrier is delivering into mailboxes or dropping the pieces off to a concierge at the front desk. USPS does not distinguish between the two situations.
2.	Walk On	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ACTION: USPS to provide R. Randall with trend data and results. <p>Barcode Quality Feedback</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are 5 proposed warning errors being assessed by USPS. • The duplicate barcode is identified in 2 different ways, on the duplicate tracking number and duplicate label event. • ACTION: W. Smith to provide examples to USPS of duplicate tracking number errors in order for USPS to examine what the pieces duplicated with. • The Keyed Barcode issue can be accommodated in the threshold because there are cases where the barcode gets altered during transit.

Action Items:

Action Item	Description	Action Item Owner
1.	Provide R. Randall with trend data and results for AT&T	USPS
2.	Send examples to USPS of duplicate tracking number errors in order for USPS to examine what the pieces duplicated with	W. Smith
3.	Align with User Group 5 (Addressing Group) on the overall address quality	J. Wilson