

Meeting Title:	MTAC PTR eVS Work Group 178		
Meeting Objective(s):	Monthly meeting with Industry		
Date:	6/1/2016	Time:	4:00-5:30 PM ET
Location:	WebEx/Juliaann's Conference Room		
Attendees:	Dennis, Alvin Serrano, Charles Tricamo, Chris Liebe, Crystal Stefanko, Christiana Halim, Dale Kennedy, Doug Ferguson, Bill Vanderveer, Gary Rogan, Henry Chau, Jaclyn Tubbin, John Papp, Maura Lowell, Oscar Vazquez, Randy Randall, Richard Porras, Roger Franco, Wanda Santos, Wendy Smith, Willie Jackson, Paul Kovlakas, Bob Schimek, Vicki Dansereau, Isaac Cronkhite, Jim Wilson, Monica Lundquist, Sharon Harrison, John Medeiros, Kevin Elkin, Lina Kelly, Marsha, Maura Lowell, Paige Eckard		

Agenda Item	Topic	Minutes
1.	Timeline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Industry sent USPS a feedback letter that recommends the User Group extend past the current target completion date on 6/15. USPS is trying to hit the core objectives that the WG was formed around.
2.	Action Item Review	<p>Look into a way to reveal IMpb Quality Non-Compliance fees without charging the assessment and without impacting the three IMpb assessed categories already in place. - OPEN</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> USPS is taking this action item under advisement. ACTION: USPS to include the dates when action items were brought up. <p>Provide performance trends for only the proposed validations.- Complete</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This action is complete. <p>Share anonymous customer lessons learned, best practices and tactics that have improved performance. - OPEN</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ACTION: USPS to include the write-up of customer lessons learned, best practices and tactics that have improved performance with today's minutes. <p>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. - OPEN</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The verbiage is included in Pub 205 as part of WG 166. It is posted on RIBBS. USPS working to reissue a process for customers to log complaints and escalate them if not addressed. <p>USPS to look into combining IMpb assessments and quality assessments for validations. – NEW</p>
3.	Industry Feedback	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> USPS has not sent valid data to Industry for review yet. "Some customers have not received valid address quality data for review on their performance, specifically customers who provide the 11 digit only in V1.7 or 2.0 SSF" "Customers have not been provided performance with the simplified list of items proposed for assessment"

Agenda Item	Topic	Minutes
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Industry is not in favor of keeping AACC. "USPS agreed and removed from AQ"
4.	IMpb Compliance Quality Metrics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> USPS made calculations by looking at the full suite of warnings/errors and then recalculated for the past 4 months by just looking at the 10 IMpb quality metrics proposed. <p>Destination Delivery Address (AQ)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> When looking at the 4 proposed AQ criteria, the trend showed an increase in performance. This includes assessing the missing secondary information, missing street number, unable to match to ZIP +4, and invalid primary street number. Sharon Harrison questioned how the thresholds were calculated. The target was based on where Industry performance was in October. There were also large customers who changed their BQ process and added additional Mailer IDs. This decreased the number of duplicate barcodes from the large shippers and increase the threshold on BQ. <p>Shipping Services File (MQ)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The new assessment includes entry facility mismatch, invalid PO of account ZIP, invalid payment methods, and invalid payment account number. Per John Medeiros, under the NSA agreement that USPS has, they process ZIPs in SPF outside the SPF footprint. eVS has exceptions for this and will not charge for destination entry facility but he is not sure that PTR has exceptions. ACTION: John Medeiros to send Bill Vanderveer examples of exceptions of customizable entry locations. ACTION: Bill Vanderveer to review and make sure customers are not being double charged with customizable entry locations. Also to look at the volume that this situation occurs to see if threshold covers it. The concern is that on the PTR side there is nothing to indicate exceptions. PTR would have no indication of the special agreements of customizable locations. These customizable entry locations should not be duplicate charged. John confirmed that USPS could charge twice or charge once because eVS could handle it as an exception. But PTR may see it as a bad entry facility ZIP and show up in the IMpb non-compliance. <p>IMpb Barcode (BQ)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The BQ assessment is for the duplicate tracking number and invalid mailer IDs. John Medeiros questioned how PTR handles seeing duplicates when files are resubmitted. Juliaann Hess confirmed that resubmitted files are a different file type. Customers are able to submit corrections if the issue is identified with the file. This will be a type 4 file rather than the original type 1 or 2 file that is submitted. ACTION: USPS to emphasize that customers can submit corrections during webinars and other documentations to Industry.
5.	Industry Feedback on Thresholds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Per Sharon Harrison, Industry is still concerned about the July thresholds. She proposed no threshold set for July. Then the group can decide a tentative target. Richard Porras proposed to move the July thresholds to 2017. Per John Medeiros, Industry does not have the data to finalize the elements. There is still open discussion about validations so it is difficult to make an informed decision on the thresholds. Sharon mentioned that even pushing the thresholds to January 2017 at least

Agenda Item	Topic	Minutes
		<p>gives Industry time to look at the data. They need good quality data first.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oscar Vazquez noted that the BQ has the lowest variance from what the established threshold is and where we currently are. He suggests to look closely at this because other thresholds have tighter constraints. • Kevin Elkin pointed out that the thresholds are based on averages for performance. Customers have different processes in place and for some, the process cannot produce the perfect labels out of printers every time. • Jim Wilson questioned what is Industries basis to measure when assessment is appropriate? • Sharon does not think that assessment is warranted if there is no financial impact to USPS as a result. • Industry wants to know what the USPS impact is for some of the quality assessments being measured. • Oscar Vazquez was wondering if this is an appropriate charge for the PRC? It is a rate increase and therefore needs to be approved by the PRC. • ACTION: USPS to include Oscar’s feedback about PRC to the deck. • “Declaration that states failure to follow the rules affects a punitive charge” • USPS does not say DPV or exact match and the current rules call for the complete address. • Industry never received declaration that failure to follow the rules would lead to penalty. This affects pricing of the product and therefore needs to be approved by PRC. • ACTION: USPS to check with legal if USPS is leveraging a charge on failure to provide certain data in adequate and legal maneuver doesn’t require PRC approval? • As for thresholds, Oscar recommends USPS using the 80/20 rule starting out. Start at a limit where 80% of mailers are demonstrating compliance, leaving 20% deviation for those mailers that need work. • However, if 80% of the mailers only cover a small volume then Industry does not want that taken into account. The thresholds should be considered with a combination of volume and the mailing industry. • Many of the shipping industry mailers are subsets of consolidators. There is concern that the mailers who use consolidators are more knowledgeable because they are in the WG. There are shippers that do not even know these changes are coming. • Industry suggested providing mailers with a discount to improve results. • “Industry proposes that USPS not assess in July because Industry does not know specific performance, but rather set thresholds to January. • Wendy Smith suggests keeping the thresholds as a target for January while extending the work group. This will allow the WG time to finalize appropriate thresholds. • Industry is not looking to increase the threshold numbers proposed for July 2016. Thresholds cannot be increased until they are understood. • Industry is concerned that they will not know what performance will look like without recalculating the numbers. • USPS has provided data that includes actual warning messages that are generating noncompliance as well as the volume for each. Customers can see the counts of the pieces that have particular noncompliance figures.

Agenda Item	Topic	Minutes
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Industry agrees that USPS is providing volume counts per warning but they need details of what is causing the warning. The package details are needed to understand the real problem and how to fix it. • USPS understands that AT&T and customers like them that only provide the 11 digit have issues because the 00 is used for default delivery point for information USPS is receiving. • Industry has not seen trending data yet. • ACTION: USPS to provide customers total performance with current criteria and with new proposed criteria with the simplified list.
6.	Proposed Validations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sharon Harrison asked what the difference was between the missing street number and invalid street number. Also she questioned if these categories would roll up into the unable to match the ZIP+4. • However, Juliaann Hess replied that the validations cannot be a subset of one another unless it is known what is in the file. USPS uses a tool to validate the information and identify issues in the logic of calculations. • ACTION: USPS to identify reasons why they would get a ZIP+4 with a missing street number or with an invalid primary street number. Why are they not a subset of the Missing Secondary Information in the DPV footnotes? • Industry is questioning what happens if there is a condition of an address that had both indicators erroring. Juliaann Hess confirmed that it would only be counted once. • Richard Porras thought that USPS agreed for the missing secondary information to come off the validation list. USPS did not agree to this. • John Medeiros mentioned that there is inequity here because customers can get a DPV match with a S record. USPS is dealing with rookies with address quality.
7.	Letter from Industry	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • USPS will send a written response to the letter received by Industry. • Industry requested the date to be pushed back to October from the June 15th end date. However, they did not have a date in mind of when to conclude the WG. They just felt that there was not enough time to settle the remaining issues. • The end date depends on when USPS can provide shippers with data to understand their issues and reasons for errors. • USPS is currently providing information back to shippers in error warning reports, USPS runs ad hoc queries that summarize these in the reports and examples. • Industry thinks that it is hard to summarize the fields in the error warning files because the codes do not appear. • Per John Medeiros there needs to be a work group on confirmation error warning reports because the data is unreliable. • ACTION: USPS to look at creating a report that is sent to customers weekly for IMpb compliance like the manifested file report. • If the group is looking for an IMpb extract then that can be further discussed in WG 178 discussions. To change the CEW, WG 178 could recommend that and then eVS/PTR user group could discuss it.
8.	Next Week's Agenda	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summary of USPS' response to the Industry Letter – tentative as there may not yet be a response. • Narrow down what AQ (secondary information) and MQ (#1 – Entry Facility Mismatch) elements the group agrees to move forward with.

Agenda Item	Topic	Minutes
		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Sharon Harrison wants to know when mailers should receive valid data to look at. Juliaann Hess confirmed that for customers like AT&T who only send the 11 digit, a fix will go into effect on August 14th with PTR Release 9.0. This data is currently run manually and should be completed by next meeting.<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ PTR has not made changes to the rules yet because USPS and Industry have not made an agreement yet.• Discussion on revising or moving forward with items that are only proposed for assessment in data that is following back to customers (“Cart before the horse issue”)• ACTION: USPS to split up the time with agenda items to keep WG on track.

Action Items:

Action Item	Description	Action Item Owner
1.	Include the dates when action items were brought up	USPS
2.	Include the write-up of customer lessons learned, best practices and tactics that have improved performance with today's minutes	USPS
3.	Look into combining IMpb assessments and quality assessments for validations	USPS
4.	Send Bill Vanderveer examples of exceptions of customizable entry locations	J. Medeiros
5.	Review and make sure customers are not being double charged with customizable entry locations. Also to look at the volume that this situation occurs to see if threshold covers it	B. Vanderveer
6.	Emphasize that customers can submit corrections during webinars and other documentations to Industry	USPS
7.	Include Oscar's feedback about PRC to the deck	USPS
8.	Check with legal if USPS is leveraging a charge on failure to provide certain data in adequate and legal maneuver doesn't require PRC approval?	USPS
9.	Provide customers total performance with current criteria and with new proposed criteria with the simplified list	USPS
10.	Identify reasons why they would get a ZIP+4 with a missing street number or with an invalid primary street number. Why are they not a subset of the Missing Secondary Information in the DPV footnotes?	USPS
11.	Look at creating a report that is sent to customers weekly for IMpb compliance like the manifested file report	USPS
12.	Split up the time with agenda items to keep WG on track	USPS