

**Mailer Technology Advisory Council (MTAC)
Meeting Report
08/05/2015 12:30 PM - 1:30 PM**

USER GROUP 4 (UG4) SESSION

AGENDA

- 1) Informed Visibility, Development & Requirements (continued)
- 2) Implementation of rIMb (93)
- 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, Development & Requirements (continued)

A recap of the previous meeting's IV development and requirements discussion was presented by Amy Cradic of Informed Visibility. Amy announced future topics and getbacks and asked if there was feedback on data access authorization and data delegation requirements.

Future Topics & Getbacks

- How Company Permissions will work in IV
- Logical Delivery Event and ZIP+4 scenarios

Data Access Authorization and Data Delegation

Discussion focused on access to data, data delegation and visibility of assumed events for containers/handling units and trays.

- Angelo – We should have the ability to see assumed events for containers/handling units and trays based on nested pieces of mail based on the Barcode MID.
 - Should be able to query specific pallets.
 - Owner of mail piece as specified in the MID and mail preparer should have this access and be able to query and perform delegation off the MID. Mail owner/preparer to do the delegation.
- Steve Krejczik – eDoc submitter shouldn't be broken out separately. The eDoc Submitter may be different from the Mail Preparer.
 - Consider setting up Mail Preparer differently, having separate access for all roles; currently only the Mail Owner and Mail Preparer (who can be the eDoc submitter) have access.
- A suggestion was to grant just the eDoc submitter view access and delegate access for container and tray level, not piece and bundle data.
- Shawn Baldwin and Judy Kalus – do not favor of default access to pieces and bundles based on the MID contained in the barcode.
 - Prefer to separate the level of access for the container and handling unit from piece level access.
- Himesh – Suggests a separate subgroup hold a focused conversation to discuss the needs, challenges, and design requirements.
- Angelo – We should discuss further with the group once Data Access Authorization has been determined.

IV Source Systems and Data Timeliness - IV System Interfaces (Slide 13)

- Amy – SASP is not involved in the solution of IV. Scan data will now come directly to IV from MPE/MHE handhelds rather than from SASP. This will remove a lot of the latency we see today.
- IV should determine the mail owner and mail preparer based on preliminary eDocs, and not wait for the eDoc to be finalized before providing container and tray scan visibility data.
- Angelo – The finalized eDoc is going to be the most accurate; however, often the mail is accepted and well into the USPS network before eDoc is finalized. Likely will have to use both.

Data Timeliness for Mail Tracking data (Slide 14)

PRODUCT INFORMATION

- Bob Rosser – In the past, the tracing data would not be used until end of run. Are we now grabbing this every 15 minutes and then sending it to the server as opposed to End of Run?
- Amy – Container scans are in real time. She will investigate Container SV Transportation scan events latency and will report back to UG4 on the reason for the 2 hour delay.
- Himesh – Currently the wi fi platform for IMD requires cradling. In the future, cradling will not be necessary.
- Scans from the DUs for Full Service on Containers, trays, and pieces are coming from IMVIS.
- Scanning every part of the container as part of the visibility process will be verified at the DUs.
- The DMUs use Full Service IMDs, and alternatives are still being considered.
- Angelo – For piece to bundle scans, does the P.O. Box include Post Box Street Addresses (PBSAs) where you can address mail pieces with a physical address, but deliver to a P.O. Box?
 - An SLA document and scorecard would be helpful in this process.
- Angelo – can a line item for curtailed mail be added?
- Amy – agreed to add curtailed mail as a line item.

Implementation of rIMb

A continuation of the rIMb implementation was presented by Himesh Patel. Guest speaker, Kai Fisher of the Address Management group provided a brief presentation on how rIMb impacts the Address Correction Service (ACS).

- rIMb deployment began Aug 3 in North Texas. A gradual rollout among additional sites will continue over the next 30 days.
- The redirect IMb will be included in the Flats Postal Automated Redirection System FPARS - it will be applied on a forwarding label on the mailer barcode.
- When redirected in PARS a new label is applied that includes the same STID, MID, and Serial number. The Barcode identifier becomes 93 along with a new routing zip.
- In the first ACS record for the first move the routing code will match to eDoc.
- rIMb barcode data is not provided in the original ACS record. Subsequent forwards/redirection records will contain the entire 93 rIMb barcode string.
- ACS will contain the updated and full zip code.
- ACS service is not being fulfilled if AMS sees the piece has a serial number field that has been duplicated.
- MTAC UG5 is covering rIMb ACS changes in more detail if anyone would like more information.
- Sharon Harrison – what other communication is USPS providing on rIMb?
- Kai – in addition to the letter that Himesh sent to IMb Tracing users, the AMS team is updating the ACS user Guide and will be sending out a letter this week as well.
- Kai – USPS documentation is explicit on using unique serial numbers in the IMb from one mailing to another. Most mailers accommodated this, but some have not.
- Sharon – would again like to recommend that USPS send out an Industry Alert or DMM Notice. Additionally, USPS may want to add this topic to the Tuesday MTAC Stakeholder meeting next week.
- There will be no MTAC UG4 Meeting on August 12. We will pick up again the week after next.

ACTION ITEM: Amy to verify that the IV requirements indicate both preliminary and finalized eDocs can be used to determine mail owner and mail preparer for the purposes of Mail Tracking.

ACTION ITEM: Amy to investigate Container SV Transportation scan events latency and will report back to UG4 on the reason for the 2 hour delay.

ACTION ITEM: Amy to update table to show caveat that IMDAS latency depends on availability of connectivity.

ACTION ITEM: Amy to add a new role to the table to include "eDoc Submitter".

ACTION ITEM: Amy to research if PBSAs is included under PO Box, and add to table if needed.

ACTION ITEM: Amy to include Curtailed Mail as a line item.

ACTION ITEM: Amy to add FS-IMD to the mail tracking list for data timeliness; update table to show assumed scans, and break out whether the MID is referring to the piece or container event.

ACTION ITEM: Himesh to send out the request to participants to join the subgroup to discuss access authorization and data delegation.