

Meeting Title:	MTAC Work Group 178 Meeting		
Meeting Objective(s):	Collaboratively establish IMpb Compliance Metrics and Thresholds		
Date:	5/5/2016	Time:	4:00 – 5:00 pm ET
Location:	WebEx/Juliaann's Conference Room		
Attendees:	Alvin Serrano, Bill Vanderveer, Charlie Johnston, Christiana Halim, Crystal Stefanko, D Kennedy, Dan Scott, DeWitt Crawford, Doug Ferguson, Gary Rogan, Henry Chau, Jim Wilson, Joe Mallozzi, John Medeiros, John Papp, Juliaann Hess, Marsha, Monica Lundquist, Oscar Vazquez, Randy Randall, Richard Porras, Roger Franco, Sharon Harrison, Vicki Bosch, Maura Lowell, Paige Eckard		

Agenda Item	Topic	Minutes
1.	Review of Action Items	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The minutes from last week omitted the action item for USPS to look at the AQ performance score without the highest volume customer. • USPS analyzed the data without the highest volume customer and the different in performance score was -.78% looking at April data. • ACTION: USPS to analyze the AQ performance data to exclude the best and worst quality performers, regardless of volume. This was agreed upon by Industry and USPS. • Stakeholders reviewed the following action items from last meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Action 1 from last meeting: <i>Provide Industry with overall national averages with those addresses that match to the DPV and S & N events, and to include achievable thresholds for AQ.</i> • ACTION: J. Wilson to send the extracted data analysis to the Work Group. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Action 2 from last meeting: <i>Include AQ footnote codes next meeting slides.</i> • Moving forward with the Work Group, the actual descriptions will be used throughout the presentations. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Action 3 from last meeting: <i>Look at the feasibility and cost to automate the process to provide a summary IMpb Compliance Assessment, to include by class and by aggregate.</i> • eVS is developing high level stories to begin estimating what it would take to include an automatic IMpb compliance assessment by aggregating class of mail. • ACTION: eVS to provide a date of when to expect the automated IMpb compliance report to begin.
2.	Objective 1: Agreed on Simplified list of Validations	<p>Quality Assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • USPS proposed to lower the number of validation assessments due to Industry's concern of there being too many. USPS proposes 4 Address Quality combinations, 2 Barcode Quality combinations, and 4 Barcode Quality combinations. The total number of validations that will be assessed is 10. • C. Halim saw reoccurring DZ errors on the file error warning report. After

Agenda Item	Topic	Minutes
		<p>investigation, the records were valid PMODs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • USPS should not be assessing a valid PMOD tracking number for AQ validation. • ACTION: USPS to review the requirements of a DZ error code and assess if PMOD records are being counted non-compliant, as they should not be. • ACTION: In the next MTAC WG meeting, USPS to review the existing IMpb compliance categories. • The current IMpb barcode format includes SSF 1.6 or higher, inclusion of the destination delivery address information or the 11 Digit DPV within the file or the shipping partner file. If customers do not provide the 11 Digit DPV or destination address to USPS prior to the scan for arrival at Post Office, then customers will be charged for not having address information which is indicated by a DZ. <p>Industry Feedback</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Per R. Randall, there are still issues with missing street numbers and secondary information. There needs to be more discussion on how USPS is gathering the data. • Per R. Porras, USPS needs consistency between shipping letters/flats and packages. Industry does not have this experience and they need more time to research. • Per J. Medeiros, Industry believes the process is moving too quick. Industry is being held to a standard that does not exist in the mailing industry today. Everyone supports address quality but the speed and higher standard is where there is push back. • Per S. Harrison, AT&T understands addressing yet are still struggling to understand it. Industry does not support assessing mailers when USPS does not give them time to assess their own performance. She suggests 6 months of good quality data for mailers to understand their own processes and fix their issues. USPS errors and processing makes it difficult for mailers to understand where the issues reside. • Per J. Medeiros, USPS deliveries increase each year and there is a latency in the system to include the new addresses. J. Wilson reveals that USPS adds about 100,000 new addresses a year and there are a total of 150 Million addresses. The shipper volume of addresses that fall into the new address but not in the USPS data yet is too low to fall under the threshold of non-compliant.
3.	Timeline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The validation assessments will begin for the month of July. • Non-eVS customers will be charged for July 31st. eVS customers will be charged for the whole month of July. • Per J. Medeiros, the group should assess if a federal register notice is needed. This seems like a Price Change. • This effort is analogous to when USPS implemented IMpb timeliness. A Work Group determined what would be measured for compliance and what requirements would be stated. • Industry agrees that it feels like a Price Change in that they cannot understand the high percentage of errors. Industry will need to invest resources and time into investigating the errors that seem costly. • Per B. Schimek, it would be beneficial for make sure the data is correct first, then allow Industry 90 days to look at internal processes and make any operational changes.

Agenda Item	Topic	Minutes
4.	Thresholds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Industry quality performance trends are increasing. • Per S. Harrison, it would be helpful for USPS to share those mailers that score high on AQ. Industry can then share current processes that are helping high performers. USPS will not reveal customer names but customers on Work Group calls can share their experiences. • In the instance of AT&T, they only provide the 11 digit without the address information. • ACTION: USPS to share anonymous customer lessons learned, best practices and tactics that have improved performance. • ACTION: USPS to address the question of when customers identify a problem, what is the escalation process to log a trouble ticket? And create a repository for the issues customers are tracking. <p>Industry Feedback</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The July 2016 timeline is aggressive. There could be large shippers using vendor software that are skewing the numbers. • The Work Group 178 charter is to agree on 2017 and 2018 thresholds. • ACTION: USPS to run a stratification analysis to show different volume size mailers and assessment performance associated with each volume. • The validation assessment is happening very quick and does not give Industry time to become knowledgeable. Timing concerns can be addressed in the thresholds. • Next week the discussion will be to determine thresholds for 2017 and 2018 performance metrics.

Action Items:

Action Item	Description	Action Item Owner
1.	Analyze the AQ performance data to exclude the best and worst performers, regardless of volume.	USPS
2.	Send the extracted data analysis to the Work Group.	J. Wilson
3.	Provide a date of when eVS can identify a date to expect the automated IMpb compliance report to begin.	eVS
4.	Review the business requirements on DZ error code validations for PMOD records, to make sure they are not counting those as non-compliance.	USPS
5.	In the next MTAC WG meeting, review the existing compliance categories for IMpb.	USPS
6.	Share April data with mailers.	USPS
7.	Share anonymous customer lessons learned, best practices and tactics that have improved performance.	USPS
8.	Address the question of when customers identify a problem, what is the escalation process to log a trouble ticket? Create a repository for the issues customers are tracking.	USPS
9.	Conduct a stratification analysis to show different volume size mailers and assessment performance associated with each volume.	J. Wilson