

Meeting Report
5/29/2013 12:30 AM -1:30 PM

USER GROUP 4 (UG4) SESSION

USPS Attendees: Himesh Patel, John Werntz, Steven Monteith, Alice Vangorder, Adam Racine

Non-USPS Attendees: UG4 Roster

AGENDA

1. Define data requirements for piece-level visibility (20 minutes)
2. Updates on Issues and Action Items (20 minutes)
 - a. Review Action Item Log – All
 - b. Review Issues Log – All
3. Feedback (10 minutes)
 - a. Updates on RIBBS site:
 - i. Container, Tray, Bundle Visibility Guides
https://ribbs.usps.gov/intelligentmail_guides/documents/tech_guides/ContainerTrayBundleVisibilityUserGuide.pdf
 - ii. Updates to STID table (July 2013)
https://ribbs.usps.gov/intelligentmail_mailpieces/documents/tech_guides/NewStidPreNotice.pdf
 - b. Identify other issues for Group to follow
4. Next meeting Date & Time: June 12, 2013; 12:30 pm to 1:30 pm
5. Any Other Business

DISCUSSION POINTS

The purpose of this meeting is to provide an ongoing forum to facilitate communications between the Postal Service and users, define and review improvements in process/production functionality and address and resolve issues.

Updates on Issues and Action Items

- Refer to Issues Log and Action Items Logs for more information.
- Randy Randall volunteered to participate in the Reply Mail subgroup.

Define data requirements for piece-level visibility

- The Identification (ID) Tag is a barcode that is applied on the back of a mail piece for the purpose of mitigating the loss of visibility on the original Intelligent Mail barcode (IMb). If an IMb's visibility is lost, a scan record cannot be traced to the Mailer Identification (MID) owner.
 - Industry is requesting for specific mail handling attributes to be supplied for proof of compliance in a legal environment. This way, it can contribute as proof that the mail in question was, in fact, handled by the Postal Service.
 - Attributes to include would be the facility name, the Ops Code and the machine number.
 - Although machine information is not shared at this time, this would be an excellent way to provide a compliance record to a number of institutions.
 - Currently, aside from the last scan, there is no way to prove/disprove delivery.
 - It was suggested to use tray/container processing time, or a similar attribute currently provisioned, and ask Legal representation if it meets the compliance definition to satisfy a potential audit trail.

PRODUCT INFORMATION

- WideFieldOfViewSequenceNumer (WFOVSeqNumber)
 - This is internal information and abstract to the industry.
 - Based on an idea from Angelo Anognostopolous - greater elaboration will be needed at the next meeting.
- Industry members were requested to consider additional data elements that could assist with their various business functions.
 - It was suggested to focus on providing the additional tier of granularity with regard to equipmentID and establish how information can be logged for audit trail visibility and compliance/legal issues.
 - Other items to consider would be the response process and whether the Postal Service can validate equipment presence in a particular facility on a particular date for confirmation.
 - The Mail Processing Equipment (MPE) ID that is reported as part of the scanning information is an ID mechanism that is managed by an internal integrated server system.
 - A virtual machine ID would need to be linked to a physical asset with a unique ID for legal purposes.
 - Every facility may not currently have record of serial number information for the various machines therein.

Next Meeting

- The next meeting will occur on Wednesday, June 12, via MeetingPlace.
 - Topics for discussion can be sent to Himesh Patel for inclusion in the UG4 agenda.
 - Topics are likely to be centered on requirements gathering efforts.
 - Team members are encouraged to start thinking about the various handling units (i.e., trays, sacks and tubs).
- Members need to be further educated on the significance of Mail Visibility so they can ensure others who are outside of the user group are also educated.
 - The Postal Service needs to ensure guides are kept up-to-date and future messaging kept consistent. Additionally, the message of visibility needs to be distributed to those that are just now looking to go into Full Service (FS) Adoption.
 - Thus far, with the January 2014 deadline upcoming, feedback from clients has not been favorable. Most that have not yet switched over are likely waiting to do so when FS is required in the last week of January.
 - Confusion still exists with regard to the bare minimum of effort necessary to be compliant - and if any extra steps are beneficial for clients to pursue. The value of the extra information being provided to them is not being taken into consideration.
 - Broader communications and messaging is needed.

ACTION ITEM TRACKING

Action Item Description:	Status:	Assigned To:	Due Date:
Action Item 15.	Open	Kevin, Reggie, Lisa	6/12/13