

**Mailer Technology Advisory Council (MTAC)  
Meeting Report  
07/22/2015 12:30 PM - 1:30 PM**

**USER GROUP 4 (UG4) SESSION**

**AGENDA**

- 1) Informed Visibility, Development & Requirements (continued), and
- 2) MTAC UG4 Updated Charter
- 3) Any Other Business (AOB)

**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.

**Informed Visibility (IV) Recap**

- Amy Cradic of Mailing Information Systems (MIS) continued the discussion on Informed Visibility, last presented to MTAC UG 4 on 7/1/15.
- Action Item: Himesh said the presentation would be posted to MITS (RIBBS).
  - Amy provided a recap of the slides covered during MTQAC UG4 on 7/1/15, where the following topics were covered.
  - Housekeeping (Meeting Recap, Future Topics, Actions)
  - Mailer/mailing Dashboard
  - Troubleshooting and Data Quality
  - Education and Documentation
  - Prioritization of File Formats
  - Mail Tracking Data Fields (will continue discussion on 7/22)
  - Piece Level Data Attributes
- Tracy Sikes – asked if the Mailer Dashboard is being focused on?
- Amy – currently the priority is working with IT on external data provisioning, and brainstorming gaps that can be filled, as well as transitioning IMb data subscriptions to IV.

**Mail Tracking Data Field Discussion**

- Some mailers would prefer to receive their data in a flat file, and others in XML depending on the file size.
- Angelo – suggested requirement: being able to query container or tray and see what is nested to it with option to see direct nested as well as indirect nested.
- Angelo - suggested requirement: ability to subscribe to container scan info, and have the option to include nested mail as part of scan event.
- Angelo - suggested requirement: Query pallet associated to tray.
  - Identify tray scan data and identify container last associated with it.
  - Option to see all containers, or just the last container, or just the original mailer container.

## PRODUCT INFORMATION

- Show date/time of association.
- Angelo - suggested requirement: be able to pull postage statement mailing date by querying eDoc to ensure it is all coming from the official source.
- It was mentioned that it might be useful for USPS to scan a container to validate that it has been paid, eliminating folks having to go to the FAST helpdesk. (That would be answered by PostalOne!)
- Amy - asked for the Mail.XML queries that would need to be supported:
  - ContainerQueryRequest and ContainerQueryResponse
  - ContainerVisibilityQueryRequest (is this the same as above?)
- Angelo - referenced the UG4 Issues Log.
- Himesh to identify if other IV requirements are listed in the Issues Log, such as the following attributes:
  - Mailing Date (can be piece or aggregate)
  - Milliseconds
  - MPE ID
- Angelo - Is IV planning to capture any image scans of mail, similar to Real Mail™ Notification.
- Randy – seconded.
- Himesh – we currently do not have a plan to do this with IV, although we can have a broader discussion in the future.
- Angelo – there is a proposal for redoing RPW reporting based on images, so there are other initiatives that may cause us to store those images.
- Randy – would like updates on Real Mail to UG4, or know if they will have a separate group; Himesh and Angelo noted that they are setting up a Work Group for this.
- Attributes:
  - Mailers want option to choose timestamp format.
  - Facility - some folks may want Facility ZIP, Locale Key, Facility Name (lower priority), NASS Code (lower priority - they are variable and can change)
  - Scan State instead of Operation Number for container and handling unit events.
- Angelo said some people may want to use a Locale or drop site key code, or NASS Code.
- Tracy - Specifically for push notifications, how will these be stored and accessible?
- Amy – there are varieties in online reporting and exports, APIs. We need to determine which ones we want to support in XML vs. API?
- Himesh – noted the desire for Online ability to view Reference data like Facility table that shows Facility ZIP, Locale Key, Facility Name, NASS Code, etc.
- Tracy Sikes – noted that he didn't want to have to configure the same file format multiple times for each subscription. The vision for IV is to be able to use a standard format or save an ad hoc format that can be used for other subscriptions/queries.
- Angelo – can we get a consumer friendly vs. technical format? For example, parcel scan events are in a more consumer friendly language vs. internal operations. In some cases, may merge multiple events and show them as consolidated.
  - Two ways to simplify scan events for users:
    - Reduce how many events they get,
    - Change how the delivered event only is displayed.
- Shawn – prefers granularity in tracking, and would like tracking events also be provided in PTR?
- Amy - IV will not have tracking events from PTR.
- Angelo – It might be nice to be able to get both the granular event/Op Code and a “Consumer-Friendly Roll-up/Aggregate” similar to what is captured for packages in PTR. So even though we see the piece on multiple passes on MPE – a summary message of “Origin Processing Complete” could be provided.
- Possible future agenda: Do we want to consolidate events to a high-level?

- Amy - Are there any there any other attributes pertaining to any containers, trays, etc.?
- Angelo - Mailers typically use IMcb or IMtb.
- Judy - how will attributes be made available (not limited to any special provisioning) and will they be available in flat files. (e.g. certificate of mailing)
- Agenda Item: Discuss attributes, definitions of fields, data elements, etc.
- Himesh – ID Tag and FICS ID Tag can be sent in the same field. Length of ID Tag can differentiate the two.
- Agenda Item: Judy would like to see future definition of attributes to expand the use of IMb Tracing to all users. IMb Tracing is thought of as proof of mail.
  - What are the attributes/values that would potentially be utilized as IMb Tracing replaces certain requirements?
  - What do we need?
  - How do we make these attributes available right out the gate? Want to make sure that not limited to XML – should be available in flat file from day 1.
- Himesh recommends we determine the business needs first, then define it.
- At the state level, USPS is seeing IMb Tracing as a viable way to show mail was delivered - not certificate of mail; courts are now upholding IMb Tracing.

**IV Discussion to be continued:** Next week slide 14 - Data Access Authorization and Data Delegation

**Agenda Item:** Himesh to Add Barcode 93 for next discussion.

**MTAC UG4 Updated Charter**

- Himesh – reviewed the updated MTAC UG4 Charter Mission Statement. There was discussion regarding the use of the term “IV and IMb Tracing: for the mission statement. Most agreed it was sufficient as it was included in the title.
- Himesh – asked if anything was missing from “Impact on Other Issues or Procedures.”
- Angelo –to be more complete, add eInduction and Seamless.
- Himesh – Agreed they are subsets to full Service and can be drawn out.
- It was noted that industry co-chairs are on a bi-annual rotation Lisa agreed to update.
- Himesh – agreed to distribute the updated Charter along with the meeting session notes and Action Item log.
- Lisa Bowes - would like the updated Charter posted to MITS, and requested the slide presentations be posted.

There were no further comments. The meeting was adjourned.

**Action Item:** Himesh to distribute the updated Charter along with the meeting session notes and Action Item log.

**Action Item:** Himesh agreed to post the 7-22-15 MTAC UG4 presentation to MITS (RIBBS).

**Action Item:** Amy to define the IMb tracing list and some other MPE elements and show at future meeting.