

**aMailer Technology Advisory Council (MTAC)
Meeting Report
09/02/2015 12:30 PM - 1:30 PM**

USER GROUP 4 (UG4) SESSION

AGENDA

- 1) IV Data Access/Data Delegation
- 2) 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.

Announcement – Angelo is stepping down as Industry Co-Chair of MTAC UG4. Thanks go out for his leadership and continued participation in this valued role. Lisa Bowes will step into the vacant spot, joining Judy Kalus will continue as Co-Chair.

Data Access and Data Delegation.

- The Mailer Industry perspective is important to USPS as it is looking at a more flexible architecture for data access and delegation.
- Today, the Mail Owner is at the top of the hierarchy; the Mail Owner and Mail Service Provider (MSP) automatically have access once an account is set up.
- There is a concern that if the MSP's MID is being used for Mail Owner, the Mail Owner would have inherent access to piece level data.
- We first need to create the hierarchy for access, then define inherent or default access rights, and who controls delegation.
- Parties allowed access will no longer be restricted to Mail Owner and MSP.
- Assigning the correct party for data delegation is complicated when the owner of the MID on a piece in a particular mailing is not consistent with the MID on the container, which could be different, i.e., when the Mail Preparer's MID is used on the container instead.
- Angelo – The MID Owner or their delegate should have access to the piece information as well as be able to work their way up the chain and see the tray/container/pallet and, and see how the mail is nested.
- Transportation Provider should have access to start-the-clock level.
- Himesh – agreed whoever has access to the piece level information should automatically have access to the rest of the nested information when it becomes available.
- There was a question as to whether the party that has the MID on the piece should have inherent rights to see data based on the MID on Tray and Container when it is different? Would they need to request authorization?
- Some confusion was noted in today's practices of what's in the MID profile and what's in eDoc, and how that affects the data the Mail Service Provider is receiving.
- The MSP is usually just interested in the container scans for mail they prepared, and therefore a business rule may be needed that looks up the Job ID or other criteria.
- It was suggested that a "MID Owner or Designee" is defined, and further, a MID Owner for Piece, MID Owner for Tray and MID Owner for Container, since they can be different.
- Tracy – eDoc rules work well as they are today, but in addition, enhancements should be made to the MID profile and the MID on Piece data.
- There was a question as to whether the Mail Owner would need to "check the box" to allow access of data to the MSP based on the party listed in By/For, or be included by default?
- Today, if a MSP's MID is on the container in eDoc, they automatically receive the scan data.
- Tracy – changing eDoc rules could potentially create an issue if it happens that the MSP is not the MID owner on the container.
- Currently there is an Inherent delay in getting information because it is tied to eDoc and the SASP processes. It would be preferable to be able to get information quicker.

PRODUCT INFORMATION

- Amy – It has been agreed to use non-finalized eDocs to determine Mail Owner and Mail Preparer.
- Today, the following entities are defined in eDoc, in By/For: Mail Owner, Mail Service Provider, eDoc Submitter, and FAST Scheduler ID.
- Tying data to the MID on Container was flagged as problematic since some MSPs have noted they are not always the MID Owner on the container, and sometimes there are mailings where the MID is not on anything. In the eDoc process there should be a way to collect the data even though there may be a slight delay depending on the point at which eDoc is submitted (dependent on class of mail).
- If just using MID on Piece, if two MSPs are using the same MID, it can only be isolated at the mailing level to determine which mailing is coming from which MSP.
- If moving away from final postage statements, there may be preliminary or eDoc submissions.
- It was noted that when the mail.dat file is not always submitted with the same job ID, information tends to be lost, or if the file has bad By/For data, it will delegate bad information.
- The question is whether this occurs at submission time or whether the statement has to get generated first and used first?
- Amy – will put together a process flow, to depict when events occur and what IV would do with this information.
- A concern was expressed about relying on eDoc for the destination-entered container information, and in which case the piece level information gets to the customer before the container level information does. To try to avoid this problem, linking the data to the Mail piece, handling unit or container would clarify who the data is being made available to.
- A scenario was illustrated where the MSP can contact the MID Owner on the container and ask to be set up through their data distribution method if the eDoc data is not sufficient.
- The problem of receiving the same information twice was discussed.
- The suggestion of tracking every scan record to see if it were provisioned or not was generally deemed unnecessary.
- Mailers expressed interest in receiving provisioned data as soon as it becomes available as well as suppressing duplicate data.
- Amy – Mailers will be able to set up the data they want provisioned to them.
- A question was raised regarding reducing dependency on eDoc.
 - Angelo – when delegating scan data, look at the MID in the barcode on the container. If it matches By/For, (MIDs are the same), that takes precedence – don't distribute it a second time. However, if the MID on the container does not match the By/For information, the data should be distributed.
- USPS needs to be careful when delegating data to another party. It can be a problem when the MID owner has not delegated the data to the same entity in eDoc.
- There may be situations where someone uses the wrong MID but the MID owner should be able to see where data has been delegated and corrective action can take place.
- Another option was suggested: The MID owner on the container can delegate and choose who gets the data.
- Bob – suggested there could be a potential conflict when the first level is MID on Container and the data is wrong, or someone has incorrectly used another's MID. There is no insight in PostalOne! as to whether it is correct or not.
- There is an assumption that if data is distributed based on MID on container, eDoc becomes available and drives data.
 - eDoc would have the erroneous MID data but By/For would be the right entity.
- Angelo – The onus is put on the MID Owner to reconcile. There will be the ability to look at the MID on piece, look up the Mail Owner and let them know if the data is coming to them by mistake.
- USPS is aware of the issues and is putting processes in place to ensure data is disseminated to the correct party.
- A best practice is to contact the Help Desk if data that does not belong to a mailer is received, or data that is expected is not received.
- Himesh – based on discussion, recommends USPS go back and do a decision tree or flow chart to aid the next discussion with MTAC UG4 on this topic.

ACTION ITEM: Amy offered to create a decision tree for data provisioning.