

Meeting Title:	MTAC PTR eVS Work Group 178		
Meeting Objective(s):	Monthly meeting with Industry		
Date:	5/25/2016	Time:	4:00-5:30 PM ET
Location:	WebEx/Juliaann's Conference Room		
Attendees:	Juliaann Hess, Vicki Bosch, Bill Vanderveer, Bob Schimek, Bryan Buri, Christiana Halim, Charlie Johnston, Chris Liebe, Crystal Stefanko, Dale Kennedy, Dan Scott, Dennis, DeWitt Crawford, Doug Ferguson, Gary Rogan, Henry Chau, Jaclyn Tubbin, Jim Wilson, John Medeiros, John Papp, Lina Kelly, Marsha, Monica Lundquist, Paul, Randy Randall, Richard Porras, Steve Belmonte, Vicki Dansereau, Willie Jackson, Maura Lowell, Paige Eckard		

Agenda Item	Topic	Minutes
1.	Timeline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As agreed upon last week, the meeting times will be extended an extra half hour on Wednesdays.
2.	Action Item Review	<p>Include John Medeiros' feedback of USPS duplicate assessments in eVS and IMpb quality for then incorrect ZIP Code in the entry facility (Entry Facility Mismatch)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> J. Medeiros can provide samples of the Facility ZIP mismatch of pieces in April data for IMpb Address Quality. eVS will not double charge for the incorrect ZIP Code in the entry facility. ACTION: USPS to include status of action items moving forward.
3.	eVS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> eVS reviewed the IMpb noncompliance report and calculations with Industry. The noncompliance report shows quality assessment items included. USPS will only assess customers on items being measured. Industry Feedback The noncompliance report is currently built at the mail class level. Industry would like to also see it at the aggregate level. C. Halim questions when USPS will charge customers. There are 2 types of payment methods. eVS customers are assessed for IMpb monthly at the end of the month. Non-eVS customers pay onsite with BMEU; they are assessed at the time that the manifest record posts to the system. Some customers have both types of payment processes. eVS updates the summary and detail reports with new records as they come in from PTR daily. The final IMpb compliance for eVS customers is assessed daily on the PTR side. It is assessed at Midnight local time on the day of the Arrival at Post Office event (Code 07). The non-eVS customers are assessed at the time USPS see the manifest (MA event). Industry recommends that USPS provide an aggregation for competitive products as a whole.

Agenda Item	Topic	Minutes
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Customers currently have an option to review the report by mail class or by aggregate. The report is currently done offline by eVS, but Industry suggests making this automated. • Agreement on the feedback: "USPS to identify the feasibility and cost to automate the process to provide a summary IMpb Compliance Assessment, to include by mail class and by aggregate (USPS note: for eVS only)." • Industry wants the option to have the report by mail class and/or by aggregate.
4.	USPS Proposal – Quality Compliance Validations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The work group reviewed the 10 proposed validations and determined those agreed upon and those disagreed upon. <p>Address Quality</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Missing Secondary Information <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ R. Randall does not think this validation should stay on the list. ○ Per J. Medeiros, there are no tools or software for Industry to get the secondary information. USPS has not developed an address matching software to gather the secondary information to match to an apartment number. ○ Wendy Smith agrees, there is no intervention in the direct mail business to prompt the secondary information. If a customer has not provided the secondary information, then mailers have no means to get it. Customers that order online that do not provide the secondary information also do not have that information on the physical printed label or in the file. ○ Per J. Medeiros, some files have up to 3 address lines and customers can get confused as to what information goes where. DHL had an issue that was resolved where they were not sending the address line 2 to USPS. The component to think about is equitability in that the parcels will get penalized. ○ There was previous conversation with the Work Group to not assess the item of missing secondary information initially. That would give USPS and Industry time to investigate and understand operational impacts. ○ USPS proposed not immediately assessing the missing secondary information validation to allow time to review, then assess it in the future. ○ Per G. Rogan, until USPS takes a deeper look into the address type S then it is not possible to assess this. ○ USPS will not undertake a system of records to maintain every name and address of everyone in the country. USPS is just asking Industry for the secondary information. ○ Per S. Belmonte, USPS is going to have to capture sites to verify they are high rises. If a customer does not provide the information then ultimately the consolidator is the one that pays the price if it is below the threshold. ○ USPS is working toward a goal for Industry to improve their performance. If the assessments were eliminated, then there would be no improvement. USPS accommodates through thresholds to allow customers to work toward these improvements. ○ There are differences in USPS with parcel vs letters/flats. In order to improve communications with customers, USPS needs the secondary information. If the information does not impact postal or handling and operations then it is fair to not assess even if USPS wants to use that information downstream. ○ S. Belmonte suggested that USPS only count assessment on buildings that

Agenda Item	Topic	Minutes
		<p>exceed a certain number of secondary addresses needed. For example, if an address comes across with missing information, then USPS should not assess it if the secondary deliveries is below 100 (or some other arbitrary number). The whole idea is that the carrier cannot identify where the package goes. Carriers typically know the route of smaller buildings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ B. Schimek also wanted USPS to consider mail centers where the final delivery is completed by the third party. However many apartment buildings are moving away from accepting bulk deliveries at leasing offices. ○ USPS is working to improve customer experience and needs the 11 digit to allow for that personal customer experience. ○ Per R. Porras, USPS should be having this conversation with the letters and flats group. ○ Industry and USPS did not come to consensus on the Missing Secondary information validation under AQ. ● Industry and USPS did come to agreement on the additional AQ measurements: Missing Street Number, Unable to Match Address to a ZIP+4 Code, and Invalid Primary Street Number. <p>Manifest Quality</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● PTR warning #1: MQ Entry Facility Mismatch <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Given that PTR and eVS will not charge for this twice, it will not be a duplicate assessment. ○ Per J. Medeiros, USPS has a lot of work with this validation. The data does not match from 3 different sources. He can prove that this is a duplicate assessment, however USPS states this would not be charged for both. ○ ACTION: J. Medeiros to send examples of MQ Entry Facility Mismatch duplicates. ○ USPS is looking for agreement to assess this starting in July. ○ S. Belmonte reminded the group that he proposed USPS to send out assessments to customers but not charge them. USPS should move forward as if everything was going in July. USPS has captured this feedback but does not necessarily agree to it. ○ Industry agrees that until the reports are consistent and the numbers match, the assessment should not be included in July. ● #193 – Invalid Method of Payments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There are codes that represent the methods of payment and some customers use invalid codes and will therefore be charged for this error. ○ J. Medeiros believes that this is a case where if the customer has the number wrong on one piece, then it is probably wrong on all pieces. ○ When customers provide the wrong payment method to USPS then the postage statement cannot be created. For non-eVS customers, if the payment method does not match then mailers are charged immediately. ○ These are easy fixes that Industry can make but they need time to do so. ○ If the manifest information is incorrect then the package could be wrongly delivered, providing customers with a poor experience. ○ Per R. Porras, this validation seems to be an outlier for revenue protection. ○ With the new USPS CAPS systems, this issue will only get larger. This validation is in place to protect Industry for the future. ○ R. Porras does not understand why eVS customers need to provide the

Agenda Item	Topic	Minutes
		<p>payment method by package.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ J. Medeiros' concern is that if this is an error in one record then it is most likely an error in others. ○ The USPS thresholds address Industry's feedback. All customers have the same opportunities to provide fixes and upload correction files. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● There was no consensus on the 4 proposed USPS MQ validations. <p>Barcode Quality</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Duplicate Tracking Numbers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 60% of USPS customer complaints are "where is my package." ○ Per Bryan Buri, his team has looked in their system because they received errors on the duplicate tracking number, but they could not find anything. There are still open questions about how the duplicates occurred because they cannot prove duplicate tracking numbers internally. ○ J. Medeiros explained that the data in the confirmation error warning reports, data from eVS, and data from IMpb compliance does not match for duplicate tracking numbers. He thinks this falls into data quality because 3 separate fields are not matching and therefore there is something wrong with the data. Many times they see a duplicate tracking number when a piece is a return from the customer is. ○ The Industry as a whole was above the 95% threshold for BQ which included the duplicate tracking number. There should be no issues with Industry being assessed by this validation. ● Invalid MID in PIC <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Without the mailer ID, customers cannot track packages. ○ If the MID is wrong, then USPS does not get paid. ○ B. Schimek thinks the agreement concern is with the timeframe. If the data was accurate and Industry had time to address issues then there may be agreement. ○ S. Belmonte believes there is not consensus due to the fear of the unknown with what USPS will be charging Industry. ● Industry does appreciate that USPS went from 69 validations down to 10. They still want to argue about the July date implementation.

Action Items:

Action Item	Description	Action Item Owner
1.	Include status of action items moving forward	USPS
2.	Send examples of MQ Entry Facility Mismatch duplicates	J. Medeiros