

**Mailer Technology Advisory Council (MTAC)
Meeting Report
09/16/2015 12:30 PM - 1:30 PM**

USER GROUP 4 (UG4) SESSION

AGENDA

- 1) IMb Tracing Backlog Issue
- 2) Data Access Authorization and Data Delegation
- 3) 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 Backlog Issue

- Reginald Williams addressed the IMb Tracking backlog of scan data and explained that the backlog is not related to mail volume, rather an influx of data packages from processing checkpoints.
- Data travels from MPEs then to IDS servers, then to IM-VIS and onto IMb Tracing.
- Network and database management teams were working together to discover the cause of the sudden influx of data.
- There was a question on the industry side regarding the monitoring of IMb Tracing and how issues are communicated, as well as a concern about whether a fail-over system exists.
- It was promised that an update would be sent out within the hour and a communication released once the situation is resolved. Further, it was explained that Himesh is investigating the system backlog and monitoring, and will provide additional information at the next update.

Refining Data Access/Data Delegation Requirements

- **Recap:**
 - It was mentioned that a large majority of users, especially those who are working in large volumes, will want to log into the BCG to look up the data.
 - Recap: Participants were directed to the MTAC UG4 Meeting Report of 9/9/15 that Himesh Patel sent by email on 9/16/15.
- The discussion focused on the Data Access Profile to view who had access to the data, and business rules for IV.
- The rules for determining Mail Owner and Mail Preparer based on By/For were reviewed. By/For rules for the order of precedence in determining the Mail Owner, USPS either looks at component file (CPT) or mail postage association file (MPA) in Mail.dat to determine the Mail Owner. The MPA file is used to determine Mail Preparer. MailPieceCreateRequest and QualificationReportCreateRequest are used in Mail.XML.
- Container and Tray events are made available to the Mail Owner and Mail Preparer (associated in eDoc) and made available to others to whom data access has been granted.
- Currently today, the way we determine who has access to the piece level data, is to look at the MID owner of the barcode on the mailpiece.
- Assumed handling events for mail: Today, Mail Owners or Mail Preparers can get actual scans of a container or tray event. IV will also provide assumed events for nested mail objects. As an example, if there is an actual container scan, we provide assumed events for any nested tray, nested bundle or nested piece.
- Transportation Scan – When a truck arrival at dock or a truck unload event occurs, then we can create assumed events based on the truck level event.
- Steve Krejcik – How does nesting work in a logical environment?
- Amy – The exact business rules still need to be determined for creating assumed events based on physical-to-logical nesting associations. For three physical trays that are all associated to one logical tray, where we know which pieces are associated to the logical tray but not the physical ones, we can either provide the assumed piece scan each and every time one of the physical trays had an event, or we can implement rules that say only if all three physical trays have an event, we would want to create the assumed piece scan at that time. There exists a possibility that unless we have all three physical trays scanned for the same event, the physical piece may not be in the physical tray that was scanned.

PRODUCT INFORMATION

- Question: So under none of these scenarios does a transportation scan create an assumed scan? If you know the mail is associated to the truck can you create an assumed scan?
- Amy – Today, No. There are no assumed transportation scans today. In the future, however, if we had a truck level event, and we knew which mail objects are associated to the truck, we can create assumed events for the container, bundle, tray or piece.
- It was requested if IV can provide new event types such as truck arrived, start unload, end unload, enroute, and crossdock, as well as Start-the-Clock and the source for starting the clock.
- Question: Will we continue to get the close-out on the appointment as well? In some cases, start the clock is the close-out of the appointment. Especially with First-Class Mail, it could be USPS Transported vs. Mailer transported. Start the clock changes depending on methods, so it helps to have this as a separate event.
- For IV, we are not changing business rules of determining start the clock.
- Terminology: It was suggested that a term other than “handling event” be used to describe a job level event such as transportation arriving. Using the word ‘scan’ may also be too generic.
- There are a number of events that occur at induction. It was suggested that IV capture a new event type of “entry point unload” scan to indicate the point in the network where the event occurred.
- Question: Which parties should be able to get the assumed scans for the pieces based on the actual container and actual tray scans?
- It was agreed that the concept of traversing up or down should be followed. Users who have access to piece level data, should have access all the way up to the pallet or truck, but users who only have access to container or tray level data should not have receive assumed events for bundles and pieces. The Data Access Authorization Profile table was updated based on the discussion.
- Assumed Bundle or Assumed Piece Scans should be provided to Mail Owner, Mail Owner Delegates, Mail Preparer and Mail Preparer Delegates.
- Although handling units (trays) and containers were thought to be in the same bucket, it was later decided that they are in fact different and rules should reflect this. MID Owner of MID on Container should be able to view container-level data; MID Owner of MID on Tray should be able to view tray-level data.
- Angelo – asserted transport companies will most likely just want data about containers. Angelo – suggested making eDoc Submitter equal to Mail Service Provider for now. FAST Scheduler should have access to Container level or above.
- There was general agreement that the Mail Owner who only has access at handling unit or container level if they are not the owner of the MID on piece, should continue to be able to re-delegate to more than one party in the to-be IV environment.
- Amy – indicated she would confirm, but did not foresee the ability to create different push subscription schedules for a given mailing by the various users who had data access as a limitation in IV. The IV team will investigate how it will be architected.
- MID Owner for MID on piece or their delegate, will be able to see actual piece and actual bundle scans. They should be able to subscribe to assumed piece scans based on actual scans of containers, trays, or bundles.
- It was estimated that in approximately 99% of cases, the eDoc Submitter (who submits electronic documentation for postage payment) and the Mail Preparer are the same entity.
- A few concerns were expressed regarding co-mingled or co-mailing environment --- we need to be able to protect one service provider from seeing another SP’s data (for competitive reasons). Accessing assumed tray scans i.e. palletizing, combining tray data from many different mailers, etc. could give unwanted visibility into someone else’s mail, and should be restricted. The mockup displayed in the meeting shows who has access to data; it does not show the data itself. Only those users with data view access would be able to obtain the scan records.
- MID Owners should be able to see who else has been delegated the scan information, whether assumed or actual.
- Flexible data provisioning, i.e., granting access based on specific jobs, a serial # range, only certain event types, or certain mail object types, appeared to be a low priority. Today, the majority of mailers choose standard data distribution models and exceptions are generally handled outside of USPS by simply forwarding the data, in particular circumstances, to another entity. Data provisioning at job or MID level – that of Mail Owner or Mail Preparer should be sufficient.
- There was discussion regarding whether to change or drop messaging in Mail.XML that gives access to scorecard or scan information, or push & pull information extending to payment and score card modernization.

For future Discussion:

- Determine business rules for the physical vs. logical scans, to see if we want to have one rule or the option for mailers to: 1) select the level they want – i.e., the scenario where all the physical objects have been handled, or 2) receive data every single time one of them has been handled to discern whether the piece was nested in that physical tray or container.
- Judy – would like to continue discussion regarding business rules for co-mingled mail.

PRODUCT INFORMATION

- Angelo – would like more in-depth discussion about access for eDoc Submitter.

Next MTAC UG4 Meeting: Lisa – confirmed we are not meeting next week on September 23, 2015 due to National PCC Week.

ACTION ITEM: Amy will send out the updated Data Access Profile tables to UG4.

DRAFT