

**Mailer Technology Advisory Council (MTAC)
Meeting Report
09/25/2014 3:00 PM – 4:00 PM**

USER GROUP 4 (UG4) – REPLY MAIL SUBGROUP SESSION

AGENDA

1. IMbA/AltP update
2. Ideate migrating to a conventional IMb solution for reply mail
3. AOB

ATTENDEES

(Those who signed in under name)

Ellie Alexander	Todd Conetta	Elke Reuning-Elliott
Angelo Anagnostopoulos	Jody Dayton	
Bill Barcheck	Himesh Patel	Additional Participants (unidentified)

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.

IMb Accounting (IMbA)

- Todd Conetta presented to the group on the IMb Accounting (IMbA) program for Qualified Business Reply Mail (QBRM).
- This functionality is part of Release 38 (R38).
- Pilot is being conducted with Navy Federal at Merrifield and USO at Brentwood.
- How will QBRM work?
- Will use ZIP+4 and ZIP+4+2 (for new customers). This combination will identify customer, account, location and card/1 oz/2 oz.
- Data will flow from MPE to IMVIS to IMbA and then to both the Performance Based Verification (PBV) and PostalOne!. PBV will use this data for sampling.
- Elke – Important to note that this is not the same effort as the beta test that was done in the past.
- Jody – Concerned about not having access to scan data to validate USPS counts as this is going to be the basis of a financial transaction.
- Angelo – Can we create a new Operation Code for final runs that will be used for counts that will be the basis of accounting/financial transactions?
- Jody – In the past beta test mailers recommendation was that the ZIP+4+2 would not be used to differentiate between card/1 oz/2 oz, etc. Instead the ZIP+4 would be specific to the product.
- Jody – Recollection was industry recommendation of no longer need to differentiate a rate for card/1 oz/2 oz.
- Todd will take Jody and Angelo's feedback to PTM (Dan Barrett).
- Jody – Not willing to necessarily migrate to a new MID-based IMb.
- Jody – Prefer to have legacy customers grandfathered and continue to be allowed to use the existing ZIP+4 approach.
- Himesh – Maintaining two types/approaches for accounting sounds problematic long-term.
- Ellie – Need to have the address to be separate from who is being billed.
- Ellie – A unique Service Type Identifier (STID) would identify the piece as being BRM. She also wants the address of the piece.

PRODUCT INFORMATION

- Would need Mailer ID (MID) + STID and some sort of image to curtail people using MIDS they are not authorized to use.
- Two key challenges:
 1. Visibility
 2. Accuracy of accounting
- Need to consider data delegation rules for all scenarios such as preparers using customer MIDs, but accepting postage charges.
- Next meeting 10/9.