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

USER GROUP 4 (UG4) SESSION

AGENDA

1) **Update on IMb Tracing Application**
2) **Update on barcoding approach for Reply Mail**
3) **IV Data Access/Distribution (Continued Discussion)**
4) **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.

IMb Tracing Application Update
USPS updated the IMb Tracing process and modified the application form. The limitation based on a 200 sample requirement was modified, and a third party can now be authorized to set up an IMb Tracing account for their client. The new form will be sent to the Help Desk and put in place next week.

Reply Mail
We have new Reply Mail STIDs set up for the new barcode, so that IM-VIS and IMb Tracing systems can handle the new STIDs. Once the development timeline is in place it will shared with UG4.

IV Data Access/Distribution – Review from Last Session

- USPS' main focus is on process and establishing the policy for provisioning data while expanding flexibility to clients.
- A key goal in this process is to identify who has the authority to establish data distribution.
- **Review of last session's discussion:**
  - There is a need to clarify when a 3rd party MID is being used on the mail object (piece, tray or container), who would have the rights and what their data access limitations should be.
  - The MID on piece (letter or flat) will drive data distribution.
  - IV is a new structure that will maximize benefits achieved through renewed processes. Mailers should expect to set up a new profile at the beginning.
  - Mailers will be able to see aggregate data based on association to piece level data.
  - Today, a MID on piece typically belongs to a mail owner who may/may not want to receive scan data; third parties or MSPs are often used to complete the mailing.
  - Trays or containers may have the MSP's MID on them. Usually the MSP sets up the profile for MID and CRID.
    - Data delegation for trays and containers is established through this process or dictated by information in eDoc.
  - eDoc adds latency to tray and container information due to its data validation process. USPS is considering a more efficient process, as with IMb Tracing for piece level data, to be able to release tray and container information without first correlating it with eDoc.

IV Data Access/Distribution (Continued Discussion)

- The MID owner is the party who has authority to establish a profile for each mail object: piece level, tray level and container level, to identify where the data should go. This would be the "first tier".
- For every MID that has been issued, the MID Owner will be allowed to define what the delegation rules are for each mail object/level.
- A question was raised as to whether there should be a default setting in the data distribution profile, and how to adjudicate it if there is a conflict with the identifying information in the profile vs. that in eDoc.
  - If the default data in the profile is different, does eDoc supersede the profile of does the profile supersede the eDoc? Should it be sent to both?
- Today there is no ability to delegate to other parties using eDoc. In the to-be IV environment we want to enable delegation

DRAFT

to other parties, however sending to both the intended and an unintended party poses a potential risk.
  - The conflict occurs solely at the tray and container level, as the piece level data is only made available through the profile.
  - Angelo – Whether the data is sent to both parties of not, the important thing is to make sure that information gets logged, so there is visibility into what occurred and corrective action can take place.
  - Himesh – Agreed if there is a conflict to provision both ways, then managing the process through providing the MID Owner with access to a log in order to monitor the flow of data would help mitigate the problem.
  - Angelo – If someone accidentally uses the wrong MID, they would not have visibility into the scan data, but the MID Owner would. In this case the onus is on the party who created the error to report it to the Help Desk.
- From a monitoring perspective, we would also want to reconcile with eDoc to be able to tie into MID/CRID or other data points, be able to look up the actual vs. the profile, and identify the entity that incorrectly used it.
- The MID owner should be able to go in and check the data delegation profile, or look at a period of time to search mailings to see which one used a particular MID by piece, tray or container. (The piece drives aggregate data distribution.)
- Question: Should a MID Owner who is set up for piece level distribution automatically receive tray and container scans associated to the mailing?
  - It was agreed that a piece owner is at a lower level and should be able to see all the way up to start the clock (container) information.
  - If you are the MID owner at a higher level (tray or container), you should not automatically see all the way down to the piece, or 'bottom up.'
  - If a party is set up to view tray level information, and it's not their MID on the piece, they won't automatically get the piece data. Piece level data would have to be delegated by the owner of the MID on the piece.
    - When a mail piece is in a tray, the tray level information would be provided each time it is scanned. This is the same for container.
  - The roll up will be by default (unless a party opts out), but drill down will not be. Piece level data will be correlated with start the clock based on the container.
  - A party at the lowest tier (piece) automatically gets all the aggregate data.
    - A point that needs further discussion is what needs to be opted in to identify each piece.
  - A MID owner's profile will be set up with an option to automatically get piece, container, or tray level data by default unless they opt out.
- Industry can better provide an estimate of the percentage of customers who are looking for roll up data or who are only interested in piece level data.
- Third Party Logistics: Should FAST schedulers see container level data or start the clock?
  - Today the FAST scheduler ID can be tied to containers and mailings and FAST appointments through eDoc.
  - By virtue of their contractual relationship, they could be given container level data, or start the clock data by default for each one of the appointments they have scheduled.
  - There was general agreement to grant permission to the party with the FAST Scheduler ID to delegate to individual carriers or logistics partners.
- Challenges with latency: Today, delegation doesn't happen until after postage statement finalization. A scheduler within SASP takes a minimum of 24 hours because data is not processed in real time, rather it is batched up once a day.
  - Amy is checking to see if the process will be moved to collect this information either at eDoc submission or upon preliminary postage statement generation. Either one of these options would occur earlier in the process than it does today.
  - Judy – would like to set latency expectations for MID owners who would by default have access to nested tray and container information in eDoc.
- Himesh – The intention is to give access to nesting information on tray and container as early in the process as possible. Tables in IV (to be confirmed) will be built for each item level record. Associated tray and container records would all be tied together in the database.
- Bob – would like to clarify plans for putting controls in place. It is understood that with various proposed MID owners for piece, tray and container, setting up delegates would be under the MID owner's control, but how does USPS plan to prevent misuse based on additional entities who should have access to tray and container information?
- A static delegation or distribution defined in the MID profile by the MID owner was proposed so that they only get data for those mailings – per a specific frequency – not defined in the MID profile, but defined in eDoc.
  - Any planned changes to the limitation to define 2-3 delegates that exist in eDoc today would have to be implemented in PostalOne.

DRAFT

- Data delegation is defined in eDoc based on a static MID profile; thus business rules are needed that will require examining the profile established by the MID owner, updating what's defined in eDoc, reconciling the two and provisioning the data according to both.
- The entities defined in eDoc are: Mail Owner, MSP, eDoc Submitter and FAST Scheduler. In order to mitigate situations where data is accidentally sent to the wrong party, it was proposed to provide a check box on the new MID profile that states "also provision to eDoc data" that could be turned on or off.
  - Although this is a good option that could build more security, the check box may prove tricky in that if eDoc is prepared by a MSP, the data might be distributed unintentionally.
- However, if a client's MID is on the piece, distributing the data will depend on who has data delegation.
- Parties upstream cannot be prevented from seeing their data, so controls will be confined to particular levels.
- There was discussion regarding the use of the CRID to delegate data rather than the MID.
- Although USPS rules state that data delegation should only be used by specifying MIDs, it was noted by some mailers that they have the ability to use the CRID fields in eDoc to delegate data.
- Himesh – the lowest level of unique identification is at the MID level. If you set up your delegation at that level, you can always roll it up to the CRID level.
- Angelo – in By/For there is specific information you have to put in the MID field for Mail Owner and MSP if the intention is to delegate data to them. USPS takes the MID, finds CRID, looks up the data delegation profile and sends the information to that entity.
  - Judy – clarified that this can be done in the mail.dat file, but doing delegation in the Business Customer Gateway (BCG) requires a MID.
- Linda Gustason – Understood that a push subscription model was set up based on the eDoc submitter CRID.
- Himesh – will investigate the CRID/MID issue and asked for samples to be sent to him.
- Lisa Bowes – Commented that the business rules are not stated clearly in the *Tray and Container User Guide (2014)* that is contradicted by the new *Full Service Guide* documentation which is 'outdated' and difficult to follow.
- Nonetheless, accurate information resides in the *Guide to Intelligent Mail* dated 5/8/2015.
- It was emphasized to Industry members that the USPS teams are currently reviewing the guides in question to update them and ensure they are accurate and coincide with one other.
- Next Session: Plan to discuss how to create the interface for the data, i.e., whether it will be a push or pull subscription. This would allow us to look at data formats and file structures, XML vs. CSV vs. Flat File, Comma Delimited, etc. Today we use FTP for IMb Tracing.
- Due to travel out of the country for Himesh next week, and Judy and Lisa away on September 23rd for National PCC Week, it was recommended that Amy lead the MTAC UG4 meeting on September 16th.

DRAFT