

**Mailer Technology Advisory Council (MTAC)
Meeting Report
10/14/2015 12:30 PM - 1:30 PM**

USER GROUP 4 (UG4) SESSION

AGENDA

- 1) IV Data Access/Delegation Wrap-Up
- 2) rIMb (93) Issues
- 3) MTAC planning
- 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.

rIMb (93) Issues

- A number of issues with the rIMb barcode that was implemented a month ago were presented.
- Two Key issues as follows:
 - 1) We are working closely with Memphis on the ACS component (Kai Fisher)
 - 2) The process from Postal One related to undocumented pieces
- This week customers began to see some of the 93 ACS records generated from the 93 rIMb.
- A number of questions have been raised regarding the differences between the 93 records derived from ACS and IMb Tracing data. There is a perception that pieces are being forwarded. Customers that were using standard mail without forwarding had concerns.
- Cases referred to as “Return to Carrier” labels, also called “No Record” mail, (when the Carrier sends something to PARS to be forwarded, but there is no “forward” on file to be found) are creating confusion.
- Standard mail goes through PARS and CFS. There is an existing sort program in PARS that is utilized, so return mail can be sorted with all the other mail in order to get it back to the carrier.
- In IMb Tracing the 93 barcode is visible when it is traveling to the carrier, however, a corresponding ACS record is not generated. Before the 93 barcode came into play, everything was working exactly the same. “No record” pieces were going back to carrier, but there was no insight into this process.
- Angelo – questioned whether there is an Op code or a set of Op Codes could be utilized in PARS to generate a scan event, so users can tell if the pieces are going back to the carrier.
- Kai Fisher – Op codes come from the data in the field, to create a specific operations code means that the plant would have to process that mail in a different operation than they do now.
- Himesh – explained that Op codes are set up based on a specific operation on the machine. There is no specific Op code or flag in the data today that indicates particular pieces ran on a PARS operation. There are 4 possible outcomes from a PARS operation: 1) Return to Sender 2) No record found (goes back to carrier) 3) Forwarded, and 4) Secure Destruction.
- These four down-flows have no specific flags indicating the path it took coming out of PARS; all four processes occur simultaneously.
- A better solution would be to identify a data flag at the PARS level, not a subsequent operation, since not every plant has PARS set up regionally and down-flows are not always predictive.
- Bob Rosser – (Industry leader on UG10) suggested changing the first 2 digits of the IMb as a potential option that would give the indication of its disposition in lieu of the Op Code that we are currently used to.
- Himesh – IMb Tracing provides data for everything that goes across the machine. When reconciling against ACS records there will be a gap; the question is what do we do with the gap? Alternatives need to be evaluated before this issue can be resolved, but USPS will begin to investigate it.
- Judy – requested a communication be released with regard to the rIMb (93).
- Himesh – agreed that other business processes impacted by rIMb are being identified, including payment that are being remediated. He will confirm with Heather Dyer and various stakeholders before releasing a global

communication.

Undocumented Pieces

- There is a process PotalOne! has for eInduction or 'seamless', where all data for scan records is reconciled against eDoc and a report of undocumented pieces is generated.
- Because the business process logic was not updated to take into account the 93 barcode, scan records with 93 do not reconcile against any record. However 18 of the 20 digits of the tracking part of the barcode are still being produced, (STID MID and Serial #) resulting in these pieces showing up as undocumented in the Mailer's scorecard.
- Business logic is being updated to reconcile this problem.
- Sharon – recalls Industry made Postal aware of the problem, and asked for ways to .look ahead for issues that impact multiple files for customers.
- Group leaders were aware that this very issue is being discussed in UG10.
- Industry was asked to provide feedback on the Undocumented 93 discussion, and to provide any examples of what mailers are experiencing on the payment side.
- There is an issue of other codes showing up as undocumented pieces: codes 41 and 83 appear in the BI.
- The fact that code 83 indicates testing and code 41 is not a valid code yet was underscored. Nonetheless, these codes are thought to be coming from Postal data, rather than Industry data.
- Industry members were asked to send in any data excerpts that illustrate these anomalies, so they can be tracked down and reconciled.
- Sharon – raised a question about customer communications and how customer touch points are handled.
- Himesh – explained his role as custodian for barcodes under his purview, and having responsibility for the corporate internal clearance process. This process includes sending notifications to every business group, assessing impact ahead of changes, submitting plans to enable business groups to ask questions, and providing feedback or request additional time if necessary. There is ample coordination being performed internally to ensure adequate time and notifications are provided prior to launching changes to Industry. He anticipates in the future more frequent and continued messaging will be released.

IV Data Access/Delegation Wrap-Up

Amy Cradic presented The updated IV Data Access/Delegation table as a recap of the business rules that had been agreed upon in recent MTAC UG4 sessions (see below table).

- The table contains four mail types: Container, Handling Unit, Bundle and Piece, and within each mail object type, three separate columns for "view" to indicate who can view actual scans, assumed scans and who has the ability to delegate visibility to another party. There was general agreement around the business rules for Data Delegation/Access in both the 'as is' and 'to be' environments.

Access Role	Container		Delegate Container Visibility	Handling Unit		Delegate Handling Unit Visibility	Bundle		Delegate Bundle Visibility	Piece		Delegate Piece Visibility
	View	View		View	View		View	View				
	Actual	Assumed ¹		Actual	Assumed ²		Actual	Assumed ³		Actual	Assumed ⁴	
Mail Owner	X	X	X	X	X	X						
Mail Owner Delegate	X	X		X	X							
Mail Preparer	X	X	X	X	X	X						
Mail Preparer Delegate	X	X		X	X							
MID Owner of MID on Container	X	X	X									
MID Owner of MID on Container Delegate	X	X										
MID Owner of MID on Tray				X	X	X						
MID Owner of MID on Tray Delegate				X	X							
MID Owner of MID on Piece	X	X		X	X		X	X	X	X	X	
MID Owner of MID on Piece Delegate	X	X		X	X		X	X		X	X	
eDoc Submitter	X	X		X	X							
FAST Scheduler	X	X										

¹ Assumed container handling events created based on transportation or mailing-level handling events.
² Assumed handling unit handling events created based on container, transportation or mailing-level handling events.
³ Assumed bundle handling events created based on handling unit, container, transportation or mailing-level handling events.
⁴ Assumed piece handling events created based on bundle, handling unit, container, transportation or mailing-level handling events.

Mail objects available through End-to-End Mail Tracking
 - Container
 - Handling Unit (Trays, Tubs, and Sacks)
 - Bundle
 - Piece

Visibility Events (Actual vs. Assumed vs. Logical Handling Events)
 - **Actual** = scan of physical mailpiece, bundle, handling unit, or container
 - **Assumed** = implied scan of nested mailpiece, bundle, handling unit, or container (i.e. The mail aggregate received an actual scan, and the nested mail receives an assumed scan)
 - **Logical** = any other implied event based on business rules.

As Is
 To Be

- Explanation of (New) Assumed event for a Container: this means there was a transportation or mailing level event that occurred. All containers related to either event would have assumed scans as well. It is a created scan for containers based on an aggregate.
- Angelo – to clarify ‘delegate’, it is understood that the recipient will be granted both actual and assumed scans, and it is up to them to decide if they want one or both.
- Amy – reiterated that USPS’ intention is to provide flexible delegation to mail owners. So far no limitations have been placed on the number of delegates. We are awaiting architecture design to know if there will be any related performance limitation.
- Mail preparer is like mail owner and can view containers and trays. With IV they can view assumed tray and container scans.
- Amy agreed to the following business rules to be made available in IV:
 - (Shawn) When the MID owner has access to the scan data, the mail owner and mail preparer in eDoc also have access to the same scan data.
 - (Angelo) Mailers will have the ability to get piece data - just to their own pieces - on a handling unit or container scan through xml messaging.
- Questions Under Review:
 - (Angelo) If you have multiple delegations from the same party to different sources, would de-duping be applied? Would they get multiple copies of the same data?
 - (Angelo) Will an entity be able to receive the same data in different file formats, or will this practice be restricted?
- Himesh – suggested that the question of different file formats would be better managed by entity type in the entity profile and recommends putting this in the parking lot.
- Himesh – announced there would be a face to face meeting at Postal headquarters on Thursday, November 19, at 0800 - the last day of MTAC.
- **Issue:** Lisa suggested adding to the log “On the IMb Tracing side: it looks like mail is being forwarded, and that’s not necessarily the case.”
- **Action Item:** (Judy) – UG4 Group members to review the slides that were sent out on Logical Delivery events (MTAC UG4 session of 9/30/15).
- **Action Item:** (Himesh) – to send out a global communique regarding USPS business processes impacted by rIMb (93).