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## Packages

Shipping partner service files for advanced notice opportunities
IMpb address quality including secondary info

Shipping partner events for intercept and redirecł

Destination entry ZIP corrections

## MTAC Pulse of the Industry Updates Packages

## PTR Agenda \& Action ltems for Focus Groups

## USPS to provide Facility IDs for DDU Return Packages

PTR is evaluating this request, working with other systems to document requirements and determine what changes would be needed to implement this functionality.

> Status of the Federal Register Notice for IMpb compliance?
> IMpb Federal Register Notice published 02/27/2018

> If USPS determines $\dagger$ destination entry ZIP Code provided by shippers is incorrect, USPS promise to provide the correct ZIP Code as part of a concession to include this element as a component of IMpb Quality Compliance?
> For packages with the Destination Rate Indicator equal "D" (Destination Delivery Unit) PTR compares the first 3 digits of the Event IIP Code from the first Arrival-At-Unit (07 Event) to the first 3 digits of the Entry Facility ZIP Code provided in the Manifest Header Record from the shipper.

## Event Names Updated In Extracł File

USPS is updating event descriptions in Customer Scan Event Extract Files to simplified language used on USPS.com, Informed Delivery, and in email and text messages to better communicate package status to customers.

- These changes will be implemented March 11, 2018.

| Event | Current | New |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 71 | DELIVERY DELAY | RESCHEDULED TO NEXT DELIVERY DAY |
| 05 | UNDELIVERABLE AS ADDRESSED | UNABLE TO DELIVER PROBLEM WITH ADDRESS |
| 03 | ACCEPT OR PICKUP | USPS IN POSSESSION OF ITEM |
| 27 | UNCLAIMED/MAX HOLD TIME <br> EXPIRED | UNCLAIMED/BEING RETURNED TO SENDER |
| TM | SHIPMENTACCEPTANCE | SHIPMENT RECEIVED ACCEPTANCE PENDING |

## IMpb Compliance

## IMpb Compliance Quality Metrics Competitive Products Only



* Effective July 2018

The objective of WG 185 was to a determine reasonable, achievable threshold target for Address Quality metric to be implemented in January 2018.

## Recommendation Summary:

MTAC Work Group \#185 recommends that the threshold for Address Quality (AQ) remain 89\%, to allow Industry awareness and adoption of the validation rules before raising the threshold level. The workgroup would like to continue working to set the overall AQ threshold for January 2019.

## Next Steps:

Continue the current WG 185 to determine a threshold recommendation for Address Quality to be implemented January 2019.

When looking to make a justification for not raising the Address Quality threshold, it was determined that more than half of the shippers who shipped more than 100 packages were unable to meet the $89 \%$ threshold for the Month of October 2017 and January 2018.


October 2017 metrics:
Mailers who shipped 100 or more packages in October $2017=2,318$ Mailers who met the $89 \%$ Address Quality Threshold = 1,059 Mailers who fell under the $89 \%$ threshold $=1,259$

January 2018 metrics:
Mailers who shipped 100 or more packages in January, $2018=2,454$
Mailers who met the 89\% Address Quality Threshold = 1,223
Mailers who fell under the $89 \%$ threshold $=1,231$

The following items are the concerns that Industry would like USPS to improve before raising the current threshold for Address Quality in January 2019:

- USPS to provide examples to the industry that illustrate the complexity of the various delivery address information formats, and to communicate the standard to not fail the validation criteria elements.
- This will include the Delivery Address Line 1 and 2 differentiation
- File format guidance and limitations when delivery address form has two lines and the file format has one line (field).
- USPS should consider creating additional fields in the Shipping Services File and/or the Shipping Partner file to provide additional space to accommodate delivery addresses that exceed the current character limit, providing 2 address lines.
- USPS to monitor and provide data analysis on numbers of the affected mailers and what elements are causing them to fail the AQ validation criteria.
- USPS to monitor and provide data analysis that shows what is on the label versus what is available in the file (relative to secondary information)
- To host IMpb Quality customer educational webinars -targeted at smaller customers/infrequent shippers and have provided IMpb Quality Deep Dives surrounding Address Quality improvements and standards.


## IMpb Compliance Visualization Dashboard Demo

Explore the possibility of providing a way for mailers to see quality metrics through a D3? Visualization:

- The current visualization will display a summary of the monthly IMpb Compliance Indicators (AQ, MQ, \& BQ)
- Mailers will be able to drill down to view compliance data at a state level which highlights IMpb compliance issues by geographic location
http://56.72.7.32:9100/YK/Project VII/versio
n 20180222/app/


## IMPB DASHBOARD DEMO

Timely, high quality, digitized address information is critical to enhancing the customer experience and leveraging operating efficiencies to increase the value and competitiveness for USPS package products

USPS will move forward with other strategies to electronically capture and correct Address Information for packages with:

- Missing Secondary Information elements
- Incomplete or incorrect street elements
- Untimely Data

IMpb Dashboard Demo Back Up Slides

## Explore the possibility of providing a way for mailers to see quality metrics through a D3?

 Visualization:- The current visualization will display a summary of the monthly IMpb Compliance Indicators (AQ, MQ, \& BQ)
- Mailers will be able to drill down to view compliance data at a state level which highlights IMpb compliance issues by geographic location


My Mail Quality - Destination State


- The dashboard will also show the monthly IMpb Compliance performance for a 6 month period to allow mailers to see trends.
- Compliance scores can also be broken down by induvial mailer for closer analyses.

My Mail Quality For The Last 6 Months


## IMpb Dashboard

- The dashboard will also breakdown AQ compliance by DPV Footnotes to help mailers identify address issues.


## Address Quality Errors Distribution

| Address Quality Errors |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| A1 | 189,916 |
| AAN1 | 59,043 |
| A1M1 | 40,882 |
| AAM3 | 208 |
| DZ | 30 |
|  | other |



- The dashboard will allow mailers to drill down and export piece level data for any IMpb Compliance issues, this will help mailers quickly identify root causes of problems.


## Non Compliant Piece Level View


*** Not all columns are displayed in the preview below but will be included in the final export.

## Data Preview - Sample 100

| Barcode | Transaction ID | Parcel MID | Mailing Date | Arrival Date | Class | Shape | Route | state | Zip Code | Reason |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 201710052027 | 699017 | 10/05/2017 | 10/05/2017 | Parcel Select Lightweight | Irregular |  | он | 45732 | $A Q$ |
|  | 201710051144 | 699016 | 10/05/2017 | 10/05/2017 | Parcel Select Lightweight | irregular |  | in | 46580 | $A Q$ |
|  | 201710052027 | 699017 | 10/05/2017 | 10/05/2017 | Parcel Select Lightweight | irregular |  | FL | 34240 | $A Q$ |
| Wate | 201710052027 | 699017 | 10/05/2017 | 10/05/2017 | Parcel Select Lightweight | irregular |  | NY | 13032 | $A Q$ |
|  | 201710052027 | 699017 | 10/05/2017 | 10/05/2017 | Parcel Select Lightweight | irregular |  | va | 20176 | $\Delta Q$ |
|  | 201710052027 | 699017 | 10/05/2017 | 10/05/2017 | Parcel Select Lightweight | irregular |  | MA | 02466 | $A Q$ |
|  | 201710051144 | 699016 | 10/05/2017 | 10/05/2017 | Parcel Select Lightweight | irregular |  | 12 | 60452 | $A Q$ |
| hemency | 201710051235 | 699016 | 10/05/2017 | 10/05/2017 | Parcel Select Lightweight | irregular |  | Az | 85705 | $A Q$ |
|  | 201710052027 | 699017 | 10/05/2017 | 10/05/2017 | Parcel Select Lightweight | irregular |  | NY | 10460 | $A Q$ |
|  | 201710051144 | 699016 | 10/05/2017 | 10/05/2017 | Parcel Select Lightweight | IRREGULAR |  | wa | 98665 | $A Q$ |

## Addressing \& Geospatial Technology

## CASS / MASS Cycle O

Informed Delivery

## Address Authority Data Exchange

## Cycle O-Highlights

Enhanced Identification of:

- PO Box only delivery ZIP Codes
" R777 phantom route \& "No-Stat" addresses
- Door Not Accessible, No Secure Location, \& Non-Delivery Days

Standardization \& DPV® confirmation of:

- PBSA - PO Box street address
- CMRA - PMB identifier \& DPV confirmation
- Single trailing alpha on a primary number
" New military addresses "OMC" \& "UMR"



## No-Stat Reason Codes

- The USPS® has added a new table to the DPV/DSF2Hash Product called No-Stat Reason Code Table.
- This table will provide details as to why the records are flagged as No-Stats.
- This table is optional and will be available beginning in the May product, which will be posted to the Electronic Product Fulfillment (EPF) website on Monday, April 23.
- During CASS ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ Cycle O certification if a ' $Y$ ' is received on the DPV No-Stat table, the N-Stat Reason code must be correctly returned.


## No-Stat Reason Code Definitions

| Reason Code | Code Description |
| :---: | :--- |
| 0 - Regular No-Stat | Indicates addresses not receiving delivery and the addresses are not <br> counted as possible deliveries. |
| $\mathbf{1 - \text { - IDA (Internal Drop Address) }}$ | These are addresses that do not receive mail delivery directly from the <br> USPS, but are delivered to a drop address that services them. |
| $\mathbf{2 - C D S}$ No-Stat | These are addresses that have not yet become deliverable. For <br> example, a new subdivision where lots and primary numbers have <br> been determined, but no structure exists yet for occupancy. |
| $\mathbf{3 - C o l l i s i o n ~}$ | These addresses do not actually DPV confirm. In this case, the ' $Y$ ' <br> should be set to an ' $N$ ' on the DPV 'A' table and all other table values <br> should be blank. |
| $\mathbf{4 - C M Z ~ ( C o l l e g e , ~ M i l i t a r y ~}$ |  |
| and other types) | These are ZIP $+4 ®$ records USPS has incorporated into the data as <br> logical delivery points but not serviced directly by USPS. |

## DPV® Return Code Enhancements

Redefine DPV Codes to better indicate the reason an address did not produce a " $Y$ " return code.

## Current Definitions:

" $Y$ " - Address was DPV confirmed for both primary and (if present) secondary numbers
" $D$ " - Address was DPV confirmed for the primary number only and the secondary number is required but missing.
"S" - Address was DPV confirmed for the primary number. A secondary number was present but unconfirmed.

- (This led to confusion as whether a secondary was required or not.)


## New Definitions: (Codes to be determined)

"S" - Address had a secondary number that was not confirmed and was not needed with the primary address number.
"New'" - Address had a secondary number that was not confirmed but a valid secondary number was needed with the primary address number.
"New" " - Address was confirmed (ex: R777) but USPS mail delivery is not made to this address. ebruary 2018

## Tentative Schedule

CASS Cycle "O" Pre-Meeting
Partnership In Tomorrow (PIT) MeetingFebruary 232018May 12018
NCOA ${ }^{\text {Link }}$ PIT ..... May 82018
Official Rules Release ..... June 12018
Send Static Data
CASS \& NCOA ${ }^{\text {Link }}$ Stage I Release
CASS \& NCOA ${ }^{\text {Link }}$ Stage II Release
MASS Test Decks Available
CASS Developers Certification Completed
MASS Manufacturers Certification CompletedSoftware Released to End-users NLT
Expiration of CASS ${ }^{\top M}$ Cycle N
Implementation of CASS Cycle O
mber 302018
September 302018October 312018February 282019
September 302019
December 312019January 312020
March 312020July 312020August 12020

## Informed Delivery 11-Digit Conflicts

## 11 -Digit De-conflicts

## Definition

Address records that are currently coded in the AMS database that share the same 11-digit delivery point. These addresses are currently ineligible for participation in the Informed Delivery program.

## Objective

Resolve the 11-digit conflicts to allow address records to become eligible to participate in the Informed Delivery program.


## Informed Delivery 11-Digit Conflicts

## 11-Digit De-conflicts Resolutions

## Option 1:

Crosswalk: Leverage existing geo-seg +4 even/odd ranges for the generation of a unique 11 -digit. It limits the use of available ZIP+4 and potential ZIP Code saturation. Also limits impact on address matching software.

## Option 2:

Convert records to a High-Rise; uniquely assigning a ZIP+4 to colliding deliveries. Potentially, $96 \%$ of the collisions can be corrected by using this method in conjunction with option 1.

## Option 3:

Create a derivative linkage table similar to LACS that will allow software to query the table to search for an equivalent but unique 11 -digit to be applied to the mail-piece. This method will be considered if necessary after options 1 and 2.

## Option 4:

No Resolution; conflict can'† be broken.

## Informed Delivery 11-Digit De-confliction

11-Digit De-conflicts Resolutions and Breakdown

| Resolution Description | Total | Capital Metro | Eastern | Great <br> Lakes | Northeast | Pacific | Southern | Western |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ZIP +4 Reassignment (Crosswalk) | 1,338,591 | 97,545 | 187,660 | 134,824 | 264,406 | 154,772 | 370,470 | 128,914 |
| AMS Coding Guidelines | 56,508 | 1,643 | 6,980 | 3,043 | 30,196 | 1,303 | 10,555 | 2,788 |
| Convert to a High-Rise Record | 2,936,756 | 128,983 | 650,235 | 368,037 | 1,301,085 | 136,348 | 208,809 | 143,259 |
| Can Not be De-Conflicted | 874,015 | 52,684 | 163,224 | 127,920 | 121,731 | 153,375 | 146,776 | 108,305 |

## Resolution By Area



## Informed Delivery 11-Digit De-confliction

## ZIP Codes with Highest Percentage of Conflicts

There are 64 ZIP Codes with 11-Digit Conflicts in the Chicago District. These ZIPs have the highest potential for implementing ZIP splits as a result of the de-conflicting effort if using the unique ZIP+4 assignment effort.


| Seven largest ZIP Codes with <br> Conflicts for Chicago District |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| ZIP CODE | TOTAL <br> CONFLICTS |
| 60618 | 13,814 |
| 60647 | 11,802 |
| 60625 | 9,632 |
| 60629 | 8,972 |
| 60639 | 8,757 |
| 60623 | 7,844 |
| 60619 | 7,729 |

## ZIP Codes with Highest Percentage of Conflicts

There are 159 ZIP Codes with 11-Digit Conflicts in the New York Metro Area. These ZIPs have the highest potential for implementing ZIP splits as a result of the de-conflicting effort if using the unique ZIP+4 is assignment effort.


Seven Largest ZIP Codes with Conflicts for New York Metro Area

| ZIP CODE | TOTAL <br> CONFLICTS |
| :---: | :---: |
| 11236 | 12,222 |
| 11234 | 9,141 |
| 11214 | 8,768 |
| 11221 | 7,321 |
| 11219 | 6,923 |
| 11208 | 6,575 |
| 11233 | 6,060 |
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## Address Authority Data Exchange

## Objective

Partner with the Department of Transportation, and their efforts, to create the National Address Database.

Compare address data received from the DOT National Address Database (NAD) to the USPS® Delivery Point File (DPF) database. Unmatched records will be researched and validated to be potentially added to AMS as a valid delivery point.


## Address Authority Data Exchange

## NAD Dała Breakdown Currently representing 13 States

Tołal Addresses Received from NAD 42,281,449

| with <br> DPF | DPF Match before AME and AEC | $30,965,575$ |
| :---: | :--- | ---: |
|  | DPF Match after AEC | $4,789,352$ |
|  | Total DPF | 949,918 |
| Match w/o <br> DPF | AME Match w/o DPF match | $36,704,845$ |
|  | AEC Match w/o DPF Match | $2,816,331$ |
| Total Match w/o DPF | 342,078 |  |
| No Match | AEC no match (could not resolve) | $\mathbf{3 , 1 5 8 , 4 0 9}$ |
|  | Bad Address (Missing ZIP and Address) | $2,418,195$ |

## Address Authority Data Exchange

## Phase I - ZIP + 4® Matches

Targeted $80 \%$ validation by $9 / 30$

- Research and validate records that match a current ZIP + 4 range, but do not match to DPF

| Match w/o DPF: |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| AME Match w/o DPF match | $2,816,331$ |
| AEC Match w/o DPF Match | 342,078 |
| Total Match w/o DPF | $\mathbf{3 , 1 5 8 , 4 0 9}$ |

- Leverage enhanced geo coordinate to determine if an address match can be made.
- Unmatched records will be loaded into GMT for verification and acceptance into AMS by the local AMS office.
- 6 Districts are currently piloting the validation process to ensure records are received and being updated in AMS appropriately.
- Status updates will be provided monthly that shows how many records have been successfully added to the AMS database.

Thank You!

MTAC
First-Class Mail

February 2018


## All Classes

## Bundle breakage data

Two sets of service data for disasters

Report that shows volume of automation flats in manual
The Future of Informed Visibility

Mail in Measurement Scorecard

Informed Visibility Update

IV - our single source for near real-time data


## Proposed Cadence of Application

Scope Review will be provided 4 weeks prior and will include:
Web changes - review wireframes
Data changes - review new fields that will be available
Demo and Documentation Preview will provided 1-2 weeks prior and include:

- Updates to User Guide
- Updates to Data Feed Specifications:
- Data Dictionary
- Sample Files / xml Messages,
- any new Op Codes

| Scope Review |  <br> Documentation <br> Preview | Release Date |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1 / 19 / 18$ | $2 / 2 / 18$ | $2 / 17 / 18$ |
| $3 / 2 / 18$ | $3 / 16 / 18$ | $4 / 1 / 18$ |
| $4 / 13 / 18$ | $4 / 27 / 18$ | $5 / 12 / 18$ |
| $5 / 25 / 18$ | $6 / 8 / 18$ | $6 / 23 / 18$ |

No Piece Scan

In FY18 Q1, about 4\% of Letters had No Visibility

| Mail Class | Mail Shape | Entry Discount | Volume with Visibility | No Visibility Volume | \% No Visibility |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Presort First Class | Letters/Cards | ORIGIN | $5,486,453,698$ | $155,762,025$ | $2.76 \%$ |
| USPS Marketing Mail | Letters | DSCF | $6,926,570,710$ | $310,289,152$ | $4.29 \%$ |
|  |  | ORIGIN | $903,892,831$ | $127,372,459$ | $12.35 \%$ |
|  |  | $844,055,360$ | $50,541,148$ | $5.65 \%$ |  |
|  |  | ASF | $60,850,551$ | $2,676,122$ | $4.21 \%$ |
|  |  | DDU | 61,992 | 3,453 | $5.28 \%$ |
| Total |  | $\mathbf{1 4 , 2 2 1 , 8 8 5 , 1 4 2}$ | $\mathbf{6 4 6 , 6 4 4 , 3 5 9}$ | $\mathbf{4 . 3 5 \%}$ |  |

In FY18 Q1, about $15 \%$ of Flats had No Visibility

| Mail Class | Mail Shape | Entry Discount | Volume with Visibility | No Visibility Volume | \% No Visibility |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| USPS Marketing Mail | Flat | DSCF | 1,814,330,379 | 254,281,697 | 12.29\% |
|  |  | ORIGIN | 221,069,753 | 45,966,052 | 17.21\% |
|  |  | DNDC | 140,035,415 | 45,231,647 | 24.41\% |
|  |  | DDU | 36,369,958 | 5,280,498 | 12.68\% |
|  |  | ASF | 2,354,093 | 5,022,337 | 68.09\% |
|  |  | ADC | 12,931 | 3,153 | 19.60\% |
| Periodicals | Flat | DSCF | 467,176,575 | 100,184,638 | 17.66\% |
|  |  | ORIGIN | 103,774,942 | 33,116,484 | 24.19\% |
|  |  | DNDC | 13,109,306 | 8,022,938 | 37.97\% |
|  |  | ADC | 10,194,590 | 3,810,830 | 27.21\% |
|  |  | DDU | 1,220,505 | 1,716,064 | 58.44\% |
|  |  | ASF | 53,753 | 17,426 | 24.48\% |
| Total |  |  | 2,809,702,200 | 502,653,764 | 15.18\% |

## Periodicals

## Deep Dive on No Piece Scan by Entry Type

- In FY18 Q1, about $20 \%$ of Periodicals did not have any visibility at the piece level
- DDU Entry had the highest \% of Periodicals which did not have any piece level visibility
- Breakdown by Entry Type:

| Entry <br> Discount Type | \% with <br> No Visibility | \% with <br> Bundle Visibility | \% with <br> FSS Visibility | \% with <br> AFSM Visibility | \% with <br> Other Visibility |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DSCF | $17.66 \%$ | $46.21 \%$ | $18.64 \%$ | $17.37 \%$ | $0.13 \%$ |
| ORIGIN | $24.19 \%$ | $28.46 \%$ | $10.97 \%$ | $35.75 \%$ | $0.62 \%$ |
| DNDC | $37.97 \%$ | $35.68 \%$ | $7.05 \%$ | $19.20 \%$ | $0.10 \%$ |
| ADC | $27.21 \%$ | $28.77 \%$ | $6.51 \%$ | $37.39 \%$ | $0.12 \%$ |
| DDU | $58.44 \%$ | $33.87 \%$ | $0.04 \%$ | $0.07 \%$ | 7.58 |
| ASF | $24.48 \%$ | $20.25 \%$ | $1.43 \%$ | $53.66 \%$ | $0.18 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 9 . 7 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 2 . 2 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 . 5 9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 . 1 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 2 5 \%}$ |

Manual Bullpen Scanning Mail \& Package Visibility

## Manual Operation Numbers

Operation 110 - Initial Breakdown

Operation 126 - Dispatch

## Nesting and Visibility

Proof-Of-Concept testing underway in two plants (Two scanner solutions)

- Scanning Container Placards or Tray/Sack Labels > Nesting


## Dependencies:

- Full Service Mailings
- eDoc Accuracy and Barcode Readability

Challenges relative to "Turnaround" Mail - Mailer is dropping Handling Units from eDoc at Delivery Units as well as origin plant

Mail Visibility Applications (MVA)

## Mail Visibility Applications <br> Mobile technology to improve operational efficiencies. <br> BC Diagnostics <br> Mail History



Two internal mobile applications launched in September 2017:

- Mail History Application
- Employees can use their USPS mobile devices to retrieve near real-time delivery information by scanning barcodes for containers, mail handling units, and single mail pieces
- Enhanced Barcode Diagnostics Application
- Employees can use their USPS mobile devices to scan barcodes to retrieve diagnostic data of the visible elements of the barcodes scanned and highlight invalid data elements

USPS is currently considering how to address long hauls.

## Addressing \& Geospatial Technology

## CASS / MASS Cycle O

Green \& Secure

## Informed Delivery

## Address Authority Data Exchange

## Cycle O-Highlights

Enhanced Identification of:

- PO Box only delivery ZIP Codes
" R777 phantom route \& "No-Stat" addresses
- Door Not Accessible, No Secure Location, \& Non-Delivery Days

Standardization \& DPV® confirmation of:

- PBSA - PO Box street address
- CMRA - PMB identifier \& DPV confirmation
- Single trailing alpha on a primary number
" New military addresses "OMC" \& "UMR"



## No-Stat Reason Codes

- The USPS® has added a new table to the DPV/DSF2Hash Product called No-Stat Reason Code Table.
- This table will provide details as to why the records are flagged as No-Stats.
- This table is optional and will be available beginning in the May product, which will be posted to the Electronic Product Fulfillment (EPF) website on Monday, April 23.
- During CASS ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ Cycle O certification if a ' $Y$ ' is received on the DPV No-Stat table, the N-Stat Reason code must be correctly returned.


## No-Stat Reason Code Definitions

| Reason Code | Code Description |
| :---: | :--- |
| 0 - Regular No-Stat | Indicates addresses not receiving delivery and the addresses are not <br> counted as possible deliveries. |
| $\mathbf{1 - \text { - IDA (Internal Drop Address) }}$ | These are addresses that do not receive mail delivery directly from the <br> USPS, but are delivered to a drop address that services them. |
| $\mathbf{2 - C D S}$ No-Stat | These are addresses that have not yet become deliverable. For <br> example, a new subdivision where lots and primary numbers have <br> been determined, but no structure exists yet for occupancy. |
| $\mathbf{3 - C o l l i s i o n ~}$ | These addresses do not actually DPV confirm. In this case, the ' $Y$ ' <br> should be set to an ' $N$ ' on the DPV 'A' table and all other table values <br> should be blank. |
| $\mathbf{4 - C M Z ~ ( C o l l e g e , ~ M i l i t a r y ~}$ |  |
| and other types) | These are ZIP $+4 ®$ records USPS has incorporated into the data as <br> logical delivery points but not serviced directly by USPS. |

## DPV® Return Code Enhancements

Redefine DPV Codes to better indicate the reason an address did not produce a " $Y$ " return code.

## Current Definitions:

" $Y$ " - Address was DPV confirmed for both primary and (if present) secondary numbers
" $D$ " - Address was DPV confirmed for the primary number only and the secondary number is required but missing.
"S" - Address was DPV confirmed for the primary number. A secondary number was present but unconfirmed.

- (This led to confusion as whether a secondary was required or not.)


## New Definitions: (Codes to be determined)

"S" - Address had a secondary number that was not confirmed and was not needed with the primary address number.
"New'" - Address had a secondary number that was not confirmed but a valid secondary number was needed with the primary address number.
"New" " - Address was confirmed (ex: R777) but USPS mail delivery is not made to this address. ebruary 2018

## Tentative Schedule

CASS Cycle "O" Pre-Meeting
Partnership In Tomorrow (PIT) MeetingFebruary 232018May 12018
NCOA ${ }^{\text {Link }}$ PIT ..... May 82018
Official Rules Release ..... June 12018
Send Static Data
CASS \& NCOA ${ }^{\text {Link }}$ Stage I Release
CASS \& NCOA ${ }^{\text {Link }}$ Stage II Release
MASS Test Decks Available
CASS Developers Certification Completed
MASS Manufacturers Certification CompletedSoftware Released to End-users NLT
Expiration of CASS ${ }^{\top M}$ Cycle N
Implementation of CASS Cycle O
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UNITED STATES
$\qquad$
UNITED STATES
UNITED STATES
PI UNITED STATES ${ }^{7}$ POSTAL SERVICE ${ }^{(8)}$

POSTAL SERVICE ®


UNITED STATES
POSTAL SERVICE
Green \＆Secure
UNITED STATES


POSTED STATES
$\qquad$



## Green \& Secure - Mail Disposition Options

## Intelligent Mail barcode is REQUIRED!

First-Class Mail ${ }^{\circledR}$

- Change Service Requested Option 1
- Change Service Requested Option 2
- Secure Destruction Service Option 1
- Secure Destruction Service Option 2

USPS Marketing Mail ${ }^{\circledR}$

- Change Service Requested Option 1
- Change Service Requested Option 2
(Forwarded USPS Marketing Mail Fees are charged for forwarded pieces)


## Option 1 recycles ALL UAA

Option 2 forwards if possible, recycles the rest
Secure Destruction shreds before recycling

## Informed Delivery 11-Digit Conflicts

## 11 -Digit De-conflicts

## Definition

Address records that are currently coded in the AMS database that share the same 11-digit delivery point. These addresses are currently ineligible for participation in the Informed Delivery program.

## Objective

Resolve the 11-digit conflicts to allow address records to become eligible to participate in the Informed Delivery program.


## Informed Delivery 11-Digit Conflicts

## 11-Digit De-conflicts Resolutions

## Option 1:

Crosswalk: Leverage existing geo-seg +4 even/odd ranges for the generation of a unique 11 -digit. It limits the use of available ZIP+4 and potential ZIP Code saturation. Also limits impact on address matching software.

## Option 2:

Convert records to a High-Rise; uniquely assigning a ZIP+4 to colliding deliveries. Potentially, $96 \%$ of the collisions can be corrected by using this method in conjunction with option 1.

## Option 3:

Create a derivative linkage table similar to LACS that will allow software to query the table to search for an equivalent but unique 11 -digit to be applied to the mail-piece. This method will be considered if necessary after options 1 and 2.

## Option 4:

No Resolution; conflict can'† be broken.

## Informed Delivery 11-Digit De-confliction

11-Digit De-conflicts Resolutions and Breakdown

| Resolution Description | Total | Capital Metro | Eastern | Great <br> Lakes | Northeast | Pacific | Southern | Western |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ZIP +4 Reassignment (Crosswalk) | 1,338,591 | 97,545 | 187,660 | 134,824 | 264,406 | 154,772 | 370,470 | 128,914 |
| AMS Coding Guidelines | 56,508 | 1,643 | 6,980 | 3,043 | 30,196 | 1,303 | 10,555 | 2,788 |
| Convert to a High-Rise Record | 2,936,756 | 128,983 | 650,235 | 368,037 | 1,301,085 | 136,348 | 208,809 | 143,259 |
| Can Not be De-Conflicted | 874,015 | 52,684 | 163,224 | 127,920 | 121,731 | 153,375 | 146,776 | 108,305 |

## Resolution By Area



## Informed Delivery 11-Digit De-confliction

## ZIP Codes with Highest Percentage of Conflicts

There are 64 ZIP Codes with 11-Digit Conflicts in the Chicago District. These ZIPs have the highest potential for implementing ZIP splits as a result of the de-conflicting effort if using the unique ZIP+4 assignment effort.


| Seven largest ZIP Codes with <br> Conflicts for Chicago District |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| ZIP CODE | TOTAL <br> CONFLICTS |
| 60618 | 13,814 |
| 60647 | 11,802 |
| 60625 | 9,632 |
| 60629 | 8,972 |
| 60639 | 8,757 |
| 60623 | 7,844 |
| 60619 | 7,729 |

## ZIP Codes with Highest Percentage of Conflicts

There are 159 ZIP Codes with 11-Digit Conflicts in the New York Metro Area. These ZIPs have the highest potential for implementing ZIP splits as a result of the de-conflicting effort if using the unique ZIP+4 is assignment effort.


Seven Largest ZIP Codes with Conflicts for New York Metro Area

| ZIP CODE | TOTAL <br> CONFLICTS |
| :---: | :---: |
| 11236 | 12,222 |
| 11234 | 9,141 |
| 11214 | 8,768 |
| 11221 | 7,321 |
| 11219 | 6,923 |
| 11208 | 6,575 |
| 11233 | 6,060 |
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## Address Authority Data Exchange

## Objective

Partner with the Department of Transportation, and their efforts, to create the National Address Database.

Compare address data received from the DOT National Address Database (NAD) to the USPS® Delivery Point File (DPF) database. Unmatched records will be researched and validated to be potentially added to AMS as a valid delivery point.


## Address Authority Data Exchange

## NAD Dała Breakdown Currently representing 13 States

Tołal Addresses Received from NAD 42,281,449

| with <br> DPF | DPF Match before AME and AEC | $30,965,575$ |
| :---: | :--- | ---: |
|  | DPF Match after AEC | $4,789,352$ |
|  | Total DPF | 949,918 |
| Match w/o <br> DPF | AME Match w/o DPF match | $36,704,845$ |
|  | AEC Match w/o DPF Match | $2,816,331$ |
|  | Total Match w/o DPF | 342,078 |
| No Match | AEC no match (could not resolve) | $\mathbf{3 , 1 5 8 , 4 0 9}$ |
|  | Bad Address (Missing ZIP and Address) | $2,418,195$ |

## Address Authority Data Exchange

## Phase I - ZIP + 4® Matches

Targeted $80 \%$ validation by $9 / 30$

- Research and validate records that match a current ZIP + 4 range, but do not match to DPF

| Match w/o DPF: |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| AME Match w/o DPF match | $2,816,331$ |
| AEC Match w/o DPF Match | 342,078 |
| Total Match w/o DPF | $\mathbf{3 , 1 5 8 , 4 0 9}$ |

- Leverage enhanced geo coordinate to determine if an address match can be made.
- Unmatched records will be loaded into GMT for verification and acceptance into AMS by the local AMS office.
- 6 Districts are currently piloting the validation process to ensure records are received and being updated in AMS appropriately.
- Status updates will be provided monthly that shows how many records have been successfully added to the AMS database.


## MTAC Pulse of the Industry Service performance Measurement

## Mail In Measurement

Approach to Increasing Mail in Measurement

## Full Service Mail Trend

In December 2017, 92\% of Commercial mail eligible for Full-Service was Full-Service

Note: Below graph depicts FS Adoption \% as an avg. for the quarter; Slide title depicts the \% for the latest month.


## In FY18 Q1, over 78\% of Full-Service mail was in Measurement

| Mail Class | Mail Shape | Commercial | Full-Service Eligible | Full-Service | In Measurement | \% of Full-Service <br> In Measurement |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| First Class Presort | Letter/Card | 9,749,483,116 | 9,372,407,989 | 8,977,992,193 | 6,635,144,431 | 73.90\% |
| First Class Presort | Flat | 169,899,657 | 151,348,578 | 126,977,479 | 87,698,212 | 69.07\% |
| USPS Marketing | Letter | 14,499,209,464 | 14,209,168,816 | 13,338,299,049 | 11,056,692,101 | 82.89\% |
| USPS Marketing | Flat | 5,817,237,048 | 3,998,819,735 | 3,566,993,218 | 2,751,423,015 | 77.14\% |
| Periodicals | Flat | 1,250,121,841 | 1,206,914,247 | 1,093,896,536 | 755,828,711 | 69.10\% |
| Total |  | 31,485,951,126 | 28,938,659,365 | 27,104,158,475 | 21,286,786,470 | 78.54\% |

## M-in-M Network

- HQ Team
- SPM - Priyanka Misri, John Nabor, Wayne Palmiter
- Accenture - Beau Rauch, Lisa Leu
- Marketing - Chip Brown III (MMS), Frank Montemayor (BMS), Phillip Parrish (MEPT)
- Networks - Prat Shah
- Area Co-Coordinators (Mail Acceptance, Operations)
- CM - Danny Luc, Dmetrius Alexander
- EA - Barry Gilbert, Regis Curtin
- GL - Linda Bergeland, Drew Mason
- NE - Michelle Saracusa, Carla Edmonds
- PA - Claudia Munoz, Kelly Porter
- SO - Beth Baughman, Rick Bay
- WE - Ray Cordova, Jon Hummel


## Resolution Chronology

" 03/2017 to 07/2017 - identify top 3 exclusion reasons for each mail class/shape and HQ team investigate high volume site/mailer pairs for root cause and resolution

- 07/2018 - publish of HQ team results in Resolution Guide
- 08/2017 onward - investigate Field inquiries regarding published resolutions and update the Guide
- 11/2017 - complete L601 correction for LA, NJ, KC, and STL NDC's for Invalid EPFED
- 11/2017 - complete Southern Area STC correction to FDB locale key and CSA's for No Start-theClock
- 01/2018 - eliminate Incorrect Entry Facility exclusion
- 02/2018 - initiate Field collaborations as method to develop resolutions for unresolved exclusions
" 03/2018 - implement resolution for Seamless BMEU entry for No Start-the-Clock


## Field Communications

- 07/2018 - publish Improved SPM Exclusions webpage
- 08/2018 onward - initiate and continue national focus on exclusion volume and resolution efforts through monthly Area Co-Coordinator checkpoints. HQ team participate in Area facilitated District Co-Coordinator checkpoints.


## Field Tools

- 07/2018 - publish Resolution Guide for Commercial Mail Excluded from Measurement (on 4th revision)
- 07/2018 - improve SPM Exclusions by Area analysis files (on 3rd revision)


## Current Resolution Efforts

- Ongoing - Field analysis of exclusions and application of resolutions w/ HQ team support
- 02/2018 - Field apply new resolution for SCF entry mail entered at co-located BMEU
- 02/2018 - HQ/Field collaboration w/ Omaha P\&DC and North Texas P\&DC to develop resolutions for Inconsistent SPM Data and No Piece Scan exclusions for letters
- 02/2018 - initiate investigation into No Piece Scan exclusion for BPM


## Results

- Mail in Measurement by FY: FY16 = 71.73\%, FY17 $=74.88 \%$, FY 18 YTD $=78.50 \%$
- 04/2017 - initiate I-MR charts to track monthly \% included by mail class/shape
- 01/2018 - initiate national chart to track FY \% and volume included by mail class/shape



District Exclusion Results (YTD Dec)


FY Trends - National (YTD Dec)


## Service Diagnostics

| First Mile |  | Origin Processing |  | Transit |  | Destination Processing |  |  |  | Unable to Assign | Last Mile |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Area |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| WESTERN |  | $\wedge$ | EASTERN | ヘ | SOUTHERN | ヘ | SOUTHERN |  | ヘ | SOUTHERN | ヘ | PACIFIC | $\uparrow$ |
| EASTERN |  |  | GREAT LAKES |  | GREAT LAKES |  | NORTHEAST |  |  | GREAT LAKES |  | CAPITAL METRO |  |
| SOUTHERN |  |  | SOUTHERN |  | WEStERN |  | WESTERN |  |  | EASTERN |  | NORTHEAST |  |
| NORTHEAST |  |  | WESTERN |  | NORTHEAST |  | CAPITAL METRO |  |  | WESTERN |  | EASTERN |  |
| CAPITAL METRO |  | $\checkmark$ | CAPITAL METRO | $\checkmark$ | EAStERN | $\checkmark$ | GREAT LAKES |  | $\checkmark$ | NORTHEAST | $\checkmark$ | WESTERN | $\checkmark$ |
| 0．00\％ | 1．00\％ |  | 0．00\％0．43\％ |  | 0．00\％8．78\％ |  | 0．00\％ | 2．14\％ |  | 0．00\％2．50\％ |  | 0．00\％ $6.62 \%$ |  |
| District |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| KENTUCKIANA |  | $\wedge$ | LAKELAND | ヘ | SOUTH FLORIDA | $\wedge$ | SOUTH FLORIDA |  | $\wedge$ | SUNCOAST | $\wedge$ | LOS ANGELES | $\wedge$ |
| ARIZONA |  |  | KENTUCKIANA |  | CENTRAL ILIINOIS |  | houston |  |  | CENTRAL ILLINOIS |  | LAKELAND |  |
| MID－AMERICA |  |  | CAPITAL |  | HOUSTON |  | LAKELAND |  |  | KENTUCKIANA |  | SAN FRANCISCO |  |
| HOUSTON |  |  | PHILADELPHIA METROPO |  | GULF ATLANTIC |  | ARIZONA |  |  | LAKELAND |  | NEWYORK |  |
| SOUTH FLORIDA |  | $\checkmark$ | MID－AMERICA | $\checkmark$ | NORTHERN NEW JERSEY | $\checkmark$ | CAPITAL |  | $\checkmark$ | NORTHLAND | $\checkmark$ | PHILADELPHIA METROPO | $\checkmark$ |
| 0．00\％ | 0．69\％ |  | 0．00\％0．27\％ |  | 0．00\％ $2.68 \%$ |  | 0．00\％ | 0．91\％ |  | 0．00\％1．28\％ |  | 0．00\％2．23\％ |  |
| Plant |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOUISVILLE |  | $\wedge$ | MILWAUKEE PRIORITY ANNE．． | $\wedge$ | CHICAGO NDC | $\wedge$ | ROYAL PALM |  | $\wedge$ | YBOR CITY | $\wedge$ | LOS ANGELES | $\wedge$ |
| KANSAS CITY NDC |  |  | LOUISVILLE |  | ROYAL PALM |  | NORTH HOUSTON |  |  | CHICAGO NDC |  | SAN FRANCISCO |  |
| NORTH HOUSTON |  |  | WASHINGTON NDC |  | NORTH HOUSTON |  | WEST VALLEY |  |  | LOUISVILLE |  | NEW YORK |  |
| WEst valley |  |  | PHILADELPHIA NDC |  | MINNEAPOLIS SAINT PAUL ．．． | RICHMOND |  |  | FORT MYERS |  | MLLWAUKEE PRIORITY ANNE．．． |  |  |
| NORFOLK |  | $\checkmark$ | KANSAS CITY NDC | $\checkmark$ | LoulsVille | $\checkmark$ | Chicago |  | $\checkmark$ | MILWAUKEE PRIORITY ANNE．．． | $\checkmark$ | PHILADELPHIA | $\checkmark$ |
| 0．00\％ | 0．65\％ |  | 0．00\％0．26\％ |  | 0．00\％ $2.10 \%$ |  | 0．00\％ | 0．86\％ |  | 0．00\％0．64\％ |  | 0．00\％2．21\％ |  |

Lane

| $530 \mathrm{PC} \propto$ ¢ 750 |  | ヘ | $773 ¢ 773$ |  | $\wedge$ | 330PM $<3330 \mathrm{PM}$ |  | $\wedge$ | $3350 C \times 335 D C$ |  | $\wedge$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 530 PC ¢ 190 |  |  | 330PM×330РM |  |  | $773 \times 773$ |  |  | $60 Z \bigcirc 339$ |  |  |
| 010PM $>012$ |  |  | 950¢＞956 |  |  | $85 \mathrm{HC}>85 \mathrm{H}$ |  |  | 60Z $\bigcirc 335 \mathrm{DC}$ |  |  |
| $530 \mathrm{PC} \propto 752$ |  |  | 078×07z |  |  | $230<230$ |  |  | 20Zos39 |  |  |
| $530 \mathrm{PC} \propto 380$ |  | $\checkmark$ | 90Z $<890$ |  | $\checkmark$ | $608>806$ |  | $\checkmark$ | $495 A X \diamond 495 A X$ |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 0．00\％ | 0．01\％ |  | 0．00\％ | 0．78\％ |  | 0．00\％ | 0．41\％ |  | 0．00\％ | 0．19\％ |  |

## Enterprise Analytics Service Performance

First-Class Mail

Commercial First-Class Mail® FY13 thru FY 18 Performance


## Enterprise Analytics Service Performance

First-Class Mail
Letters


| Q2TD thru 1/26/18 | Total Pieces Measured | Processing On-Time | Last Mile Impact | Overall Score | Target Score | SPLY Pieces Measured | Volume Change | SPLY Overall QTD Score | SPLY <br> Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Presort Overnight | 214,684,469 | 97.59\% | -2.43\% | 95.16\% | 96.80\% | 217,477,591 | -1.28\% | 96.06\% | -0.90\% |
| Presort 2-Day | 421,620,516 | 95.16\% | -2.48\% | 92.68\% | 96.50\% | 399,218,500 | 5.61\% | 95.01\% | -2.33\% |
| Presort 3-to-5-Day | 1,518,700,548 | 89.00\% | -2.36\% | 86.64\% | 95.25\% | 1,393,810,826 | 8.96\% | 91.00\% | -4.36\% |
| 3-Day | 1,510,592,823 | 88.98\% | -2.36\% | 86.62\% | 95.25\% | 1,385,423,086 | 9.03\% | 91.00\% | -4.37\% |
| 4-Day | 7,759,516 | 93.02\% | -1.68\% | 91.34\% | 95.25\% | 8,004,002 | -3.05\% | 92.78\% | -1.44\% |
| 5-Day | 348,209 | 75.26\% | -1.80\% | 73.46\% | 95.25\% | 383,738 | -9.26\% | 84.07\% | -10.61\% |
| Presort Total | 2,155,005,533 |  |  | 88.67\% | 96.00\% | 2,010,506,917 | 7.19\% | 92.35\% | -3.68\% |

[^0]Last Mile Impact Trend


ఒFCM Overnight $\quad$-FCM 2-Day $\quad$-FCM 3-To-5-Day

Note: Commercial mail results starting week ending 10/28/16 are based on Days Left Group (DLG) approach, whereas all prior weeks' results are based on Last Processing Operation (LPO) approach. Service performance measurement was suspended for mail originating from or destined to Caribbean District starting $9 / 16 / 17$ due to the devastating

## All Q2TD FCM Letters scores would be above 96.94\% (prior to last mile), if pieces that failed by 1 day passed



## Enterprise Analytics Service Performance

First-Class Mail
Flats


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Q2TD thru } \\ & \text { 1/26/18 } \end{aligned}$ | Total Pieces Measured | Processing On-Time | Last Mile Impact | Overall Score | Target Score | SPLY Pieces Measured | Volume Change | SPLY Overall QTD Score | SPLY <br> Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Presort Overnight | 1,529,036 | 87.14\% | -8.43\% | 78.71\% | 96.80\% | 1,646,100 | -7.11\% | 83.28\% | -4.57\% |
| Presort 2-Day | 5,186,814 | 85.44\% | -9.49\% | 75.95\% | 96.50\% | 5,085,167 | 2.00\% | 82.25\% | -6.30\% |
| Presort 3-to-5-Day | 17,820,120 | 78.93\% | -8.44\% | 70.49\% | 95.25\% | 18,233,208 | -2.27\% | 76.53\% | -6.04\% |
| 3-Day | 17,752,746 | 78.91\% | -8.44\% | 70.47\% | 95.25\% | 18,152,049 | -2.20\% | 76.50\% | -6.02\% |
| 4-Day | 65,219 | 84.57\% | -8.00\% | 76.57\% | 95.25\% | 78,445 | -16.86\% | 83.70\% | -7.13\% |
| 5-Day | 2,155 | 84.18\% | -8.22\% | 75.96\% | 95.25\% | 2,714 | -20.60\% | 82.76\% | -6.80\% |
| Presort Total | 24,535,970 |  |  | 72.16\% | 96.00\% | 24,964,475 | -1.72\% | 78.14\% | -5.98\% |

[^1]
## Last Mile Impact Trend



Note: Commercial mail results starting week ending 10/28/16 are based on Days Left Group (DLG) approach, whereas all prior weeks' results are based on Last Processing Operation (LPO) approach. Service performance measurement was suspended for mail originating from or destined to Caribbean District starting $9 / 16 / 17$ due to the devastating


Note: Service performance measurement was suspended for mail originating from or destined to Caribbean District in FY18 Q1 and Q2 due to the devastating impacts of Hurricanes Irma and Maria.
Mail destined to FSS Zone and Non-FSS Zone is determined based on L006 Labeling List.

## Two-Day Last Mile Impact



Note: Service performance measurement was suspended for mail originating from or destined to Caribbean District in FY18 Q1 and Q2 due to the devastating impacts of Hurricanes Irma and Maria.
Febru Mail destined to FSS Zone and Non-FSS Zone is determined based on L006 Labeling List.

## Three-to-Five-Day Last Mile Impact



Note: Service performance measurement was suspended for mail originating from or destined to Caribbean District in FY18 Q1 and Q2 due to the devastating impacts of Hurricanes Irma and Maria.
Mail destined to FSS Zone and Non-FSS Zone is determined based on L006 Labeling List.

All Q2TD FCM Flats scores would be above $91.07 \%$ (prior to last mile), if pieces that failed by 1 day passed


Thank You!

## Appendix

## IMpb Compliance Visualization Dashboard Demo

Explore the possibility of providing a way for mailers to see quality metrics through a D3? Visualization:

- The current visualization will display a summary of the monthly IMpb Compliance Indicators (AQ, MQ, \& BQ)
- Mailers will be able to drill down to view compliance data at a state level which highlights IMpb compliance issues by geographic location
http://56.72.7.32:9100/YK/Project VII/versio
n 20180222/app/


## IMPB DASHBOARD DEMO

## All Classes

## Bundle breakage data

Two sets of service data for disasters

Report that shows volume of automation flats in manual
The Future of Informed Visibility

Mail in Measurement Scorecard

Informed Visibility Update

## Informed Visibility® Update

IV - our single source for near real-time data


## Proposed Cadence of Application

Scope Review will be provided 4 weeks prior and will include:
Web changes - review wireframes
Data changes - review new fields that will be available
Demo and Documentation Preview will provided 1-2 weeks prior and include:

- Updates to User Guide
- Updates to Data Feed Specifications:
- Data Dictionary
- Sample Files / xml Messages,
- any new Op Codes

| Scope Review |  <br> Documentation <br> Preview | Release Date |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1 / 19 / 18$ | $2 / 2 / 18$ | $2 / 17 / 18$ |
| $3 / 2 / 18$ | $3 / 16 / 18$ | $4 / 1 / 18$ |
| $4 / 13 / 18$ | $4 / 27 / 18$ | $5 / 12 / 18$ |
| $5 / 25 / 18$ | $6 / 8 / 18$ | $6 / 23 / 18$ |

No Piece Scan

In FY18 Q1, about 4\% of Letters had No Visibility

| Mail Class | Mail Shape | Entry Discount | Volume with Visibility | No Visibility Volume | \% No Visibility |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Presort First Class | Letters/Cards | ORIGIN | $5,486,453,698$ | $155,762,025$ | $2.76 \%$ |
| USPS Marketing Mail | Letters | DSCF | $6,926,570,710$ | $310,289,152$ | $4.29 \%$ |
|  |  | ORIGIN | $903,892,831$ | $127,372,459$ | $12.35 \%$ |
|  |  | DNDC | $844,055,360$ | $50,541,148$ | $5.65 \%$ |
|  |  | ASF | $60,850,551$ | $2,676,122$ | $4.21 \%$ |
|  |  | DDU | 61,992 | 3,453 | $5.28 \%$ |
| Total |  |  | $\mathbf{1 4 , 2 2 1 , 8 8 5 , 1 4 2}$ | $\mathbf{6 4 6 , 6 4 4 , 3 5 9}$ | $\mathbf{4 . 3 5 \%}$ |

In FY18 Q1, about $15 \%$ of Flats had No Visibility

| Mail Class | Mail Shape | Entry Discount | Volume with Visibility | No Visibility Volume | \% No Visibility |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| USPS Marketing Mail | Flat | DSCF | 1,814,330,379 | 254,281,697 | 12.29\% |
|  |  | ORIGIN | 221,069,753 | 45,966,052 | 17.21\% |
|  |  | DNDC | 140,035,415 | 45,231,647 | 24.41\% |
|  |  | DDU | 36,369,958 | 5,280,498 | 12.68\% |
|  |  | ASF | 2,354,093 | 5,022,337 | 68.09\% |
|  |  | ADC | 12,931 | 3,153 | 19.60\% |
| Periodicals | Flat | DSCF | 467,176,575 | 100,184,638 | 17.66\% |
|  |  | ORIGIN | 103,774,942 | 33,116,484 | 24.19\% |
|  |  | DNDC | 13,109,306 | 8,022,938 | 37.97\% |
|  |  | ADC | 10,194,590 | 3,810,830 | 27.21\% |
|  |  | DDU | 1,220,505 | 1,716,064 | 58.44\% |
|  |  | ASF | 53,753 | 17,426 | 24.48\% |
| Total |  |  | 2,809,702,200 | 502,653,764 | 15.18\% |

## Periodicals

## Deep Dive on No Piece Scan by Entry Type

- In FY18 Q1, about $20 \%$ of Periodicals did not have any visibility at the piece level
- DDU Entry had the highest \% of Periodicals which did not have any piece level visibility
- Breakdown by Entry Type:

| Entry <br> Discount Type | \% with <br> No Visibility | \% with <br> Bundle Visibility | \% with <br> FSS Visibility | \% with <br> AFSM Visibility | \% with <br> Other Visibility |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DSCF | $17.66 \%$ | $46.21 \%$ | $18.64 \%$ | $17.37 \%$ | $0.13 \%$ |
| ORIGIN | $24.19 \%$ | $28.46 \%$ | $10.97 \%$ | $35.75 \%$ | $0.62 \%$ |
| DNDC | $37.97 \%$ | $35.68 \%$ | $7.05 \%$ | $19.20 \%$ | $0.10 \%$ |
| ADC | $27.21 \%$ | $28.77 \%$ | $6.51 \%$ | $37.39 \%$ | $0.12 \%$ |
| DDU | $58.44 \%$ | $33.87 \%$ | $0.04 \%$ | $0.07 \%$ | 7.58 |
| ASF | $24.48 \%$ | $20.25 \%$ | $1.43 \%$ | $53.66 \%$ | $0.18 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 9 . 7 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 2 . 2 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 . 5 9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 . 1 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 2 5 \%}$ |

Manual Bullpen Scanning Mail \& Package Visibility

## Manual Operation Numbers

Operation 110 - Initial Breakdown

Operation 126 - Dispatch

## Nesting and Visibility

Proof-Of-Concept testing underway in two plants (Two scanner solutions)

- Scanning Container Placards or Tray/Sack Labels > Nesting


## Dependencies:

- Full Service Mailings
- eDoc Accuracy and Barcode Readability

Challenges relative to "Turnaround" Mail - Mailer is dropping Handling Units from eDoc at Delivery Units as well as origin plant

Mail Visibility Applications (MVA)

## Mail Visibility Applications <br> Mobile technology to improve operational efficiencies. <br> BC Diagnostics <br> Mail History



Two internal mobile applications launched in September 2017:

- Mail History Application
- Employees can use their USPS mobile devices to retrieve near real-time delivery information by scanning barcodes for containers, mail handling units, and single mail pieces
- Enhanced Barcode Diagnostics Application
- Employees can use their USPS mobile devices to scan barcodes to retrieve diagnostic data of the visible elements of the barcodes scanned and highlight invalid data elements

USPS is currently considering how to address long hauls.

## Addressing \& Geospatial Technology

## CASS / MASS Cycle O

## Informed Delivery

## Address Authority Data Exchange

## Periodicals

## Cycle O-Highlights

Enhanced Identification of:

- PO Box only delivery ZIP Codes
" R777 phantom route \& "No-Stat" addresses
- Door Not Accessible, No Secure Location, \& Non-Delivery Days

Standardization \& DPV® confirmation of:

- PBSA - PO Box street address
- CMRA - PMB identifier \& DPV confirmation
- Single trailing alpha on a primary number
" New military addresses "OMC" \& "UMR"



## No-Stat Reason Codes

- The USPS® has added a new table to the DPV/DSF2Hash Product called No-Stat Reason Code Table.
- This table will provide details as to why the records are flagged as No-Stats.
- This table is optional and will be available beginning in the May product, which will be posted to the Electronic Product Fulfillment (EPF) website on Monday, April 23.
- During CASS ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ Cycle O certification if a ' $Y$ ' is received on the DPV No-Stat table, the N-Stat Reason code must be correctly returned.


## No-Stat Reason Code Definitions

| Reason Code | Code Description |
| :---: | :--- |
| 0 - Regular No-Stat | Indicates addresses not receiving delivery and the addresses are not <br> counted as possible deliveries. |
| $\mathbf{1 - I D A}$ (Internal Drop Address) | These are addresses that do not receive mail delivery directly from the <br> USPS, but are delivered to a drop address that services them. |
| $\mathbf{2 - C D S}$ No-Stat | These are addresses that have not yet become deliverable. For <br> example, a new subdivision where lots and primary numbers have <br> been determined, but no structure exists yet for occupancy. |
| $\mathbf{3 - C o l l i s i o n ~}$ | These addresses do not actually DPV confirm. In this case, the ' $Y$ ' <br> should be set to an ' $N$ ' on the DPV 'A' table and all other table values <br> should be blank. |
| $\mathbf{4 - C M Z ~ ( C o l l e g e , ~ M i l i t a r y ~}$ |  |
| and other types) | These are ZIP $+4 ®$ records USPS has incorporated into the data as <br> logical delivery points but not serviced directly by USPS. |

## DPV® Return Code Enhancements

Redefine DPV Codes to better indicate the reason an address did not produce a " $Y$ " return code.

## Current Definitions:

" $Y$ " - Address was DPV confirmed for both primary and (if present) secondary numbers
" $D$ " - Address was DPV confirmed for the primary number only and the secondary number is required but missing.
"S" - Address was DPV confirmed for the primary number. A secondary number was present but unconfirmed.

- (This led to confusion as whether a secondary was required or not.)


## New Definitions: (Codes to be determined)

"S" - Address had a secondary number that was not confirmed and was not needed with the primary address number.
"New'" - Address had a secondary number that was not confirmed but a valid secondary number was needed with the primary address number.
"New" " - Address was confirmed (ex: R777) but USPS mail delivery is not made to this address. ebruary 2018

## Tentative Schedule

CASS Cycle "O" Pre-Meeting
Partnership In Tomorrow (PIT) MeetingFebruary 232018May 12018
NCOA ${ }^{\text {Link }}$ PIT ..... May 82018
Official Rules Release ..... June 12018
Send Static Data
CASS \& NCOA ${ }^{\text {Link }}$ Stage I Release
CASS \& NCOA ${ }^{\text {Link }}$ Stage II Release
MASS Test Decks Available
CASS Developers Certification Completed
MASS Manufacturers Certification CompletedSoftware Released to End-users NLT
Expiration of CASS ${ }^{\top M}$ Cycle N
Implementation of CASS Cycle O
$\qquad$

## Informed Delivery 11-Digit Conflicts

## 11 -Digit De-conflicts

## Definition

Address records that are currently coded in the AMS database that share the same 11-digit delivery point. These addresses are currently ineligible for participation in the Informed Delivery program.

## Objective

Resolve the 11-digit conflicts to allow address records to become eligible to participate in the Informed Delivery program.


## Informed Delivery 11-Digit Conflicts

## 11-Digit De-conflicts Resolutions

## Option 1:

Crosswalk: Leverage existing geo-seg +4 even/odd ranges for the generation of a unique 11 -digit. It limits the use of available ZIP+4 and potential ZIP Code saturation. Also limits impact on address matching software.

## Option 2:

Convert records to a High-Rise; uniquely assigning a ZIP+4 to colliding deliveries. Potentially, $96 \%$ of the collisions can be corrected by using this method in conjunction with option 1.

## Option 3:

Create a derivative linkage table similar to LACS that will allow software to query the table to search for an equivalent but unique 11 -digit to be applied to the mail-piece. This method will be considered if necessary after options 1 and 2.

## Option 4:

No Resolution; conflict can'† be broken.

## Informed Delivery 11-Digit De-confliction

11-Digit De-conflicts Resolutions and Breakdown

| Resolution Description | Total | Capital Metro | Eastern | Great <br> Lakes | Northeast | Pacific | Southern | Western |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ZIP +4 Reassignment (Crosswalk) | 1,338,591 | 97,545 | 187,660 | 134,824 | 264,406 | 154,772 | 370,470 | 128,914 |
| AMS Coding Guidelines | 56,508 | 1,643 | 6,980 | 3,043 | 30,196 | 1,303 | 10,555 | 2,788 |
| Convert to a High-Rise Record | 2,936,756 | 128,983 | 650,235 | 368,037 | 1,301,085 | 136,348 | 208,809 | 143,259 |
| Can Not be De-Conflicted | 874,015 | 52,684 | 163,224 | 127,920 | 121,731 | 153,375 | 146,776 | 108,305 |

## Resolution By Area



## Informed Delivery 11-Digit De-confliction

## ZIP Codes with Highest Percentage of Conflicts

There are 64 ZIP Codes with 11-Digit Conflicts in the Chicago District. These ZIPs have the highest potential for implementing ZIP splits as a result of the de-conflicting effort if using the unique ZIP+4 assignment effort.


| Seven largest ZIP Codes with <br> Conflicts for Chicago District |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| ZIP CODE | TOTAL <br> CONFLICTS |
| 60618 | 13,814 |
| 60647 | 11,802 |
| 60625 | 9,632 |
| 60629 | 8,972 |
| 60639 | 8,757 |
| 60623 | 7,844 |
| 60619 | 7,729 |

## ZIP Codes with Highest Percentage of Conflicts

There are 159 ZIP Codes with 11-Digit Conflicts in the New York Metro Area. These ZIPs have the highest potential for implementing ZIP splits as a result of the de-conflicting effort if using the unique ZIP+4 is assignment effort.


Seven Largest ZIP Codes with Conflicts for New York Metro Area

| ZIP CODE | TOTAL <br> CONFLICTS |
| :---: | :---: |
| 11236 | 12,222 |
| 11234 | 9,141 |
| 11214 | 8,768 |
| 11221 | 7,321 |
| 11219 | 6,923 |
| 11208 | 6,575 |
| 11233 | 6,060 |



$\qquad$
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## Address Authority Data Exchange

## Objective

Partner with the Department of Transportation, and their efforts, to create the National Address Database.

Compare address data received from the DOT National Address Database (NAD) to the USPS® Delivery Point File (DPF) database. Unmatched records will be researched and validated to be potentially added to AMS as a valid delivery point.


## Address Authority Data Exchange

## NAD Dała Breakdown Currently representing 13 States

Tołal Addresses Received from NAD 42,281,449

| with <br> DPF | DPF Match before AME and AEC | $30,965,575$ |
| :---: | :--- | ---: |
|  | DPF Match after AEC | $4,789,352$ |
|  | Total DPF | 949,918 |
| Match w/o <br> DPF | AME Match w/o DPF match | $36,704,845$ |
|  | AEC Match w/o DPF Match | $2,816,331$ |
|  | Total Match w/o DPF | 342,078 |
| No Match | AEC no match (could not resolve) | $\mathbf{3 , 1 5 8 , 4 0 9}$ |
|  | Bad Address (Missing ZIP and Address) | $2,418,195$ |

## Address Authority Data Exchange

## Phase I - ZIP + 4® Matches

Targeted $80 \%$ validation by 9/30

- Research and validate records that match a current ZIP + 4 range, but do not match to DPF

| Match w/o DPF: |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| AME Match w/o DPF match | $2,816,331$ |
| AEC Match w/o DPF Match | 342,078 |
| Total Match w/o DPF | $\mathbf{3 , 1 5 8 , 4 0 9}$ |

- Leverage enhanced geo coordinate to determine if an address match can be made.
- Unmatched records will be loaded into GMT for verification and acceptance into AMS by the local AMS office.
- 6 Districts are currently piloting the validation process to ensure records are received and being updated in AMS appropriately.
- Status updates will be provided monthly that shows how many records have been successfully added to the AMS database.
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## ACS ${ }^{T M}$ Reconciliation Process

Retirement of the Periodical Reconciliation process effective with implementation of the Address Quality Census Assessment

Discontinuation of Reconciliation Reports \& Scan Rates
Shipping Notice will report Traditional ACS counts \& fees

- Traditional ACS notices will be charged unless:
- Full Service publisher meet the $95 \%$ volume threshold
- and includes an ACS STID in the IMb

Traditional ACS notices will be charged when:

- Traditional ACS STID is used in IMb
- Publisher does not meet Full Service volume threshold


## PS Form 3579

Effective with the Address Quality Census Measurement \& Assessment Process implementation:

- PS Forms 3579 will be charged when Manual Corrections are requested or required
- PS Form 3579 notices are generated when:
- IMb™ contains a Manual Corrections Service Type ID (STID)
- Invalid IMb, No IMb, or IMb Unreadable
- IMb contains a Traditional ACS STID but:
- No Participant ID
- Invalid Participant ID \&/or Keyline
- Unreadable Participant ID \&/or Keyline

The font* used for the Participant ID \& Keyline is critical

## Periodicals

PARS \& FPARS Form 3579

## Quarter 12018

| COA |  | 652,079 | (448) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nixie |  | 726,544 | (49\%) |
| Early COA (Form 3579 before day 60 -suppressed |  | 103,532 | (7\%) |
| $1 \mathrm{Mb}^{\text {TM }}$ Not Present | 205,354 | (14\%) |  |
| IMb Present | 1,276,801 | (86\%) |  |
| Manual Correction STID in IMb | 1,085,359 | (85\%) |  |
| Invalid STID in IMb | 18,779 | (1\%) |  |
| * Traditional ACS STID in IMb | 115,143 | (14\%) |  |
| No Participant ID | 103,138 | (90\%) |  |
| Invalid Participant ID | 12,005 | (10\%) |  |
| Forms 3579 Generated |  | 1,482,155 |  |
| Forms 3579 Sent |  | 1,373,461 |  |

## MTAC Pulse of the Industry Service performance Measurement

## Mail In Measurement

Approach to Increasing Mail in Measurement

## Full Service Mail Trend

In December 2017, 92\% of Commercial mail eligible for Full-Service was Full-Service

Note: Below graph depicts FS Adoption \% as an avg. for the quarter; Slide title depicts the \% for the latest month.


## In FY18 Q1, over 78\% of Full-Service mail was in Measurement

| Mail Class | Mail Shape | Commercial | Full-Service Eligible | Full-Service | In Measurement | \% of Full-Service <br> In Measurement |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| First Class Presort | Letter/Card | 9,749,483,116 | 9,372,407,989 | 8,977,992,193 | 6,635,144,431 | 73.90\% |
| First Class Presort | Flat | 169,899,657 | 151,348,578 | 126,977,479 | 87,698,212 | 69.07\% |
| USPS Marketing | Letter | 14,499,209,464 | 14,209,168,816 | 13,338,299,049 | 11,056,692,101 | 82.89\% |
| USPS Marketing | Flat | 5,817,237,048 | 3,998,819,735 | 3,566,993,218 | 2,751,423,015 | 77.14\% |
| Periodicals | Flat | 1,250,121,841 | 1,206,914,247 | 1,093,896,536 | 755,828,711 | 69.10\% |
| Total |  | 31,485,951,126 | 28,938,659,365 | 27,104,158,475 | 21,286,786,470 | 78.54\% |

## M-in-M Network

- HQ Team
- SPM - Priyanka Misri, John Nabor, Wayne Palmiter
- Accenture - Beau Rauch, Lisa Leu
- Marketing - Chip Brown III (MMS), Frank Montemayor (BMS), Phillip Parrish (MEPT)
- Networks - Prat Shah
- Area Co-Coordinators (Mail Acceptance, Operations)
- CM - Danny Luc, Dmetrius Alexander
- EA - Barry Gilbert, Regis Curtin
- GL - Linda Bergeland, Drew Mason
- NE - Michelle Saracusa, Carla Edmonds
- PA - Claudia Munoz, Kelly Porter
- SO - Beth Baughman, Rick Bay
- WE - Ray Cordova, Jon Hummel


## Resolution Chronology

" 03/2017 to 07/2017 - identify top 3 exclusion reasons for each mail class/shape and HQ team investigate high volume site/mailer pairs for root cause and resolution

- 07/2018 - publish of HQ team results in Resolution Guide
- 08/2017 onward - investigate Field inquiries regarding published resolutions and update the Guide
- 11/2017 - complete L601 correction for LA, NJ, KC, and STL NDC's for Invalid EPFED
- 11/2017 - complete Southern Area STC correction to FDB locale key and CSA's for No Start-theClock
- 01/2018 - eliminate Incorrect Entry Facility exclusion
- 02/2018 - initiate Field collaborations as method to develop resolutions for unresolved exclusions
" 03/2018 - implement resolution for Seamless BMEU entry for No Start-the-Clock
February ${ }^{2018}$ Pending - Long Haul exclusion dependent on completion of MVA Trailer Visibility application


## Field Communications

- 07/2018 - publish Improved SPM Exclusions webpage
- 08/2018 onward - initiate and continue national focus on exclusion volume and resolution efforts through monthly Area Co-Coordinator checkpoints. HQ team participate in Area facilitated District Co-Coordinator checkpoints.


## Field Tools

- 07/2018 - publish Resolution Guide for Commercial Mail Excluded from Measurement (on 4th revision)
- 07/2018 - improve SPM Exclusions by Area analysis files (on 3rd revision)


## Current Resolution Efforts

- Ongoing - Field analysis of exclusions and application of resolutions w/ HQ team support
- 02/2018 - Field apply new resolution for SCF entry mail entered at co-located BMEU
- 02/2018 - HQ/Field collaboration w/ Omaha P\&DC and North Texas P\&DC to develop resolutions for Inconsistent SPM Data and No Piece Scan exclusions for letters
- 02/2018 - initiate investigation into No Piece Scan exclusion for BPM


## Results

- Mail in Measurement by FY: FY16 = 71.73\%, FY17 $=74.88 \%$, FY 18 YTD $=78.50 \%$
- 04/2017 - initiate I-MR charts to track monthly \% included by mail class/shape
- 01/2018 - initiate national chart to track FY \% and volume included by mail class/shape



District Exclusion Results (YTD Dec)


FY Trends - National (YTD Dec)


## Service Diagnostics

| First Mile |  | Origin Processing |  | Transit |  | Destination Processing |  |  |  | Unable to Assign | Last Mile |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Area |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| WESTERN |  | $\wedge$ | EASTERN | ヘ | SOUTHERN | ヘ | SOUTHERN |  | ヘ | SOUTHERN | ヘ | PACIFIC | $\uparrow$ |
| EASTERN |  |  | GREAT LAKES |  | GREAT LAKES |  | NORTHEAST |  |  | GREAT LAKES |  | CAPITAL METRO |  |
| SOUTHERN |  |  | SOUTHERN |  | WEStERN |  | WESTERN |  |  | EASTERN |  | NORTHEAST |  |
| NORTHEAST |  |  | WESTERN |  | NORTHEAST |  | CAPITAL METRO |  |  | WESTERN |  | EASTERN |  |
| CAPITAL METRO |  | $\checkmark$ | CAPITAL METRO | $\checkmark$ | EAStERN | $\checkmark$ | GREAT LAKES |  | $\checkmark$ | NORTHEAST | $\checkmark$ | WESTERN | $\checkmark$ |
| 0．00\％ | 1．00\％ |  | 0．00\％0．43\％ |  | 0．00\％8．78\％ |  | 0．00\％ | 2．14\％ |  | 0．00\％2．50\％ |  | 0．00\％ $6.62 \%$ |  |
| District |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| KENTUCKIANA |  | $\wedge$ | LAKELAND | ヘ | SOUTH FLORIDA | $\wedge$ | SOUTH FLORIDA |  | $\wedge$ | SUNCOAST | $\wedge$ | LOS ANGELES | $\wedge$ |
| ARIZONA |  |  | KENTUCKIANA |  | CENTRAL ILIINOIS |  | houston |  |  | CENTRAL ILLINOIS |  | LAKELAND |  |
| MID－AMERICA |  |  | CAPITAL |  | HOUSTON |  | LAKELAND |  |  | KENTUCKIANA |  | SAN FRANCISCO |  |
| HOUSTON |  |  | PHILADELPHIA METROPO |  | GULF ATLANTIC |  | ARIZONA |  |  | LAKELAND |  | NEWYORK |  |
| SOUTH FLORIDA |  | $\checkmark$ | MID－AMERICA | $\checkmark$ | NORTHERN NEW JERSEY | $\checkmark$ | CAPITAL |  | $\checkmark$ | NORTHLAND | $\checkmark$ | PHILADELPHIA METROPO | $\checkmark$ |
| 0．00\％ | 0．69\％ |  | 0．00\％0．27\％ |  | 0．00\％ $2.68 \%$ |  | 0．00\％ | 0．91\％ |  | 0．00\％1．28\％ |  | 0．00\％2．23\％ |  |
| Plant |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOUISVILLE |  | $\wedge$ | MILWAUKEE PRIORITY ANNE．． | $\wedge$ | CHICAGO NDC | $\wedge$ | ROYAL PALM |  | $\wedge$ | YBOR CITY | $\wedge$ | LOS ANGELES | $\wedge$ |
| KANSAS CITY NDC |  |  | LOUISVILLE |  | ROYAL PALM |  | NORTH HOUSTON |  |  | CHICAGO NDC |  | SAN FRANCISCO |  |
| NORTH HOUSTON |  |  | WASHINGTON NDC |  | NORTH HOUSTON |  | WEST VALLEY |  |  | LOUISVILLE |  | NEW YORK |  |
| WEst valley |  |  | PHILADELPHIA NDC |  | MINNEAPOLIS SAINT PAUL ．．． | RICHMOND |  |  | FORT MYERS |  | MLLWAUKEE PRIORITY ANNE．．． |  |  |
| NORFOLK |  | $\checkmark$ | KANSAS CITY NDC | $\checkmark$ | LoulsVille | $\checkmark$ | Chicago |  | $\checkmark$ | MILWAUKEE PRIORITY ANNE．．． | $\checkmark$ | PHILADELPHIA | $\checkmark$ |
| 0．00\％ | 0．65\％ |  | 0．00\％0．26\％ |  | 0．00\％ $2.10 \%$ |  | 0．00\％ | 0．86\％ |  | 0．00\％0．64\％ |  | 0．00\％2．21\％ |  |

Lane

| $530 \mathrm{PC} \propto$ ¢ 750 |  | ヘ | $773 ¢ 773$ |  | $\wedge$ | 330PM $<3330 \mathrm{PM}$ |  | $\wedge$ | $3350 C \times 335 D C$ |  | $\wedge$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 530 PC ¢ 190 |  |  | 330PM×330РM |  |  | $773 \times 773$ |  |  | $60 Z \bigcirc 339$ |  |  |
| 010PM $>012$ |  |  | 950¢＞956 |  |  | $85 \mathrm{HC}>85 \mathrm{H}$ |  |  | 60Z $\bigcirc 335 \mathrm{DC}$ |  |  |
| $530 \mathrm{PC} \propto 752$ |  |  | 078×07z |  |  | $230<230$ |  |  | 20Zos39 |  |  |
| $530 \mathrm{PC} \propto 380$ |  | $\checkmark$ | 90Z $<890$ |  | $\checkmark$ | $608>806$ |  | $\checkmark$ | $495 A X \diamond 495 A X$ |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 0．00\％ | 0．01\％ |  | 0．00\％ | 0．78\％ |  | 0．00\％ | 0．41\％ |  | 0．00\％ | 0．19\％ |  |

## Enterprise Analytics Service Performance

Periodicals
Flats

## Destination Entry IMB® Periodicals FY 13 thru FY 18 Performance

 By Quarter


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Q2TD thru } \\ & \text { 1/26/18 } \end{aligned}$ | Total Pieces Measured | Processing On-Time | Last Mile Impact | Overall Score | Target Score | SPLY Pieces Measured | Volume Change | SPLY Overall QTD Score | SPLY <br> Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SCF Flats | 162,691,105 | 93.07\% | -8.75\% | 84.32\% | 91.80\% | 173,208,597 | -6.07\% | 86.59\% | -2.27\% |
| ADC Flats | 3,604,967 | 93.82\% | -7.36\% | 86.46\% | 91.80\% | 3,662,792 | -1.58\% | 88.49\% | -2.03\% |
| E2E Flats | 29,542,544 | 71.64\% | -4.68\% | 66.96\% | 91.80\% | 32,942,683 | -10.32\% | 68.87\% | -1.91\% |
| 2-Day | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 3-Day | 8,531,085 | 84.66\% | -5.12\% | 79.54\% | 91.80\% | 11,509,381 | -25.88\% | 84.16\% | -4.63\% |
| 4-Day | 13,688,668 | 69.98\% | -4.88\% | 65.10\% | 91.80\% | 12,695,526 | 7.82\% | 67.66\% | -2.56\% |
| 5-Day | 277,773 | 64.53\% | -4.90\% | 59.63\% | 91.80\% | 656,393 | -57.68\% | 57.18\% | 2.45\% |
| 6+ Day | 7,045,018 | 59.38\% | -3.77\% | 55.61\% | 91.80\% | 8,081,383 | -12.82\% | 49.93\% | 5.68\% |
| Total | 195,838,616 |  |  | 80.56\% | 91.80\% | 209,814,072 | -6.66\% | 82.31\% | -1.75\% |

## Last Mile Impact Trend



Note: Results starting week ending 10/28/16 are based on Days Left Group (DLG) approach, whereas all prior weeks' results are based on Last Processing Operation (LPO) approach. Service performance measurement was suspended for mail originating from or destined to Caribbean District starting $9 / 16 / 17$ due to the devastating impacts of Hurricanes

## Destination-Entry Last Mile Impact



Note: Service performance measurement was suspended for mail originating from or destined to Caribbean District in FY18 Q1 and Q2 due to the devastating impacts of Hurricanes Irma and Maria.

## End-to-End Last Mile Impact



Note: Service performance measurement was suspended for mail originating from or destined to Caribbean District in FY18 Q1 and Q2 due to the devastating impacts of Hurricanes Irma and Maria.

## Overall Last Mile Impac $\dagger$



Note: Service performance measurement was suspended for mail originating from or destined to Caribbean District in FY18 Q1 and Q2 due to the devastating impacts of Hurricanes Irma and Maria.
Mail destined to FSS Zone and Non-FSS Zone is determined based on L006 Labeling List.

Q2TD DSCF and DADC Periodicals scores would be above $97.76 \%$ (prior to last mile), if pieces that failed by 1 day passed


Thank You!

## Appendix

## IMpb Compliance Visualization Dashboard Demo

Explore the possibility of providing a way for mailers to see quality metrics through a D3? Visualization:

- The current visualization will display a summary of the monthly IMpb Compliance Indicators (AQ, MQ, \& BQ)
- Mailers will be able to drill down to view compliance data at a state level which highlights IMpb compliance issues by geographic location
http://56.72.7.32:9100/YK/Project VII/versio
n 20180222/app/


## IMPB DASHBOARD DEMO

MTAC
Marketing Mail

February 2018


## All Classes

## Bundle breakage data

Two sets of service data for disasters

Report that shows volume of automation flats in manual
The Future of Informed Visibility

Mail in Measurement Scorecard

Informed Visibility Update

IV - our single source for near real-time data


## Proposed Cadence of Application

Scope Review will be provided 4 weeks prior and will include:
Web changes - review wireframes
Data changes - review new fields that will be available
Demo and Documentation Preview will provided 1-2 weeks prior and include:

- Updates to User Guide
- Updates to Data Feed Specifications:
- Data Dictionary
- Sample Files / xml Messages,
- any new Op Codes

| Scope Review |  <br> Documentation <br> Preview | Release Date |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1 / 19 / 18$ | $2 / 2 / 18$ | $2 / 17 / 18$ |
| $3 / 2 / 18$ | $3 / 16 / 18$ | $4 / 1 / 18$ |
| $4 / 13 / 18$ | $4 / 27 / 18$ | $5 / 12 / 18$ |
| $5 / 25 / 18$ | $6 / 8 / 18$ | $6 / 23 / 18$ |

No Piece Scan

In FY18 Q1, about 4\% of Letters had No Visibility

| Mail Class | Mail Shape | Entry Discount | Volume with Visibility | No Visibility Volume | \% No Visibility |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Presort First Class | Letters/Cards | ORIGIN | $5,486,453,698$ | $155,762,025$ | $2.76 \%$ |
| USPS Marketing Mail | Letters | DSCF | $6,926,570,710$ | $310,289,152$ | $4.29 \%$ |
|  |  | ORIGIN | $903,892,831$ | $127,372,459$ | $12.35 \%$ |
|  |  | $844,055,360$ | $50,541,148$ | $5.65 \%$ |  |
|  |  | ASF | $60,850,551$ | $2,676,122$ | $4.21 \%$ |
|  |  | DDU | 61,992 | 3,453 | $5.28 \%$ |
| Total |  | $\mathbf{1 4 , 2 2 1 , 8 8 5 , 1 4 2}$ | $\mathbf{6 4 6 , 6 4 4 , 3 5 9}$ | $\mathbf{4 . 3 5 \%}$ |  |

In FY18 Q1, about $15 \%$ of Flats had No Visibility

| Mail Class | Mail Shape | Entry Discount | Volume with Visibility | No Visibility Volume | \% No Visibility |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| USPS Marketing Mail | Flat | DSCF | 1,814,330,379 | 254,281,697 | 12.29\% |
|  |  | ORIGIN | 221,069,753 | 45,966,052 | 17.21\% |
|  |  | DNDC | 140,035,415 | 45,231,647 | 24.41\% |
|  |  | DDU | 36,369,958 | 5,280,498 | 12.68\% |
|  |  | ASF | 2,354,093 | 5,022,337 | 68.09\% |
|  |  | ADC | 12,931 | 3,153 | 19.60\% |
| Periodicals | Flat | DSCF | 467,176,575 | 100,184,638 | 17.66\% |
|  |  | ORIGIN | 103,774,942 | 33,116,484 | 24.19\% |
|  |  | DNDC | 13,109,306 | 8,022,938 | 37.97\% |
|  |  | ADC | 10,194,590 | 3,810,830 | 27.21\% |
|  |  | DDU | 1,220,505 | 1,716,064 | 58.44\% |
|  |  | ASF | 53,753 | 17,426 | 24.48\% |
| Total |  |  | 2,809,702,200 | 502,653,764 | 15.18\% |

## Periodicals

## Deep Dive on No Piece Scan by Entry Type

- In FY18 Q1, about $20 \%$ of Periodicals did not have any visibility at the piece level
- DDU Entry had the highest \% of Periodicals which did not have any piece level visibility
- Breakdown by Entry Type:

| Entry <br> Discount Type | \% with <br> No Visibility | \% with <br> Bundle Visibility | \% with <br> FSS Visibility | \% with <br> AFSM Visibility | \% with <br> Other Visibility |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DSCF | $17.66 \%$ | $46.21 \%$ | $18.64 \%$ | $17.37 \%$ | $0.13 \%$ |
| ORIGIN | $24.19 \%$ | $28.46 \%$ | $10.97 \%$ | $35.75 \%$ | $0.62 \%$ |
| DNDC | $37.97 \%$ | $35.68 \%$ | $7.05 \%$ | $19.20 \%$ | $0.10 \%$ |
| ADC | $27.21 \%$ | $28.77 \%$ | $6.51 \%$ | $37.39 \%$ | $0.12 \%$ |
| DDU | $58.44 \%$ | $33.87 \%$ | $0.04 \%$ | $0.07 \%$ | 7.58 |
| ASF | $24.48 \%$ | $20.25 \%$ | $1.43 \%$ | $53.66 \%$ | $0.18 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 9 . 7 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 2 . 2 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 . 5 9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 . 1 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 2 5 \%}$ |

Manual Bullpen Scanning Mail \& Package Visibility

## Manual Operation Numbers

Operation 110 - Initial Breakdown

Operation 126 - Dispatch

## Nesting and Visibility

Proof-Of-Concept testing underway in two plants (Two scanner solutions)

- Scanning Container Placards or Tray/Sack Labels > Nesting


## Dependencies:

- Full Service Mailings
- eDoc Accuracy and Barcode Readability

Challenges relative to "Turnaround" Mail - Mailer is dropping Handling Units from eDoc at Delivery Units as well as origin plant

Mail Visibility Applications (MVA)

## Mail Visibility Applications <br> Mobile technology to improve operational efficiencies. <br> BC Diagnostics <br> Mail History



Two internal mobile applications launched in September 2017:

- Mail History Application
- Employees can use their USPS mobile devices to retrieve near real-time delivery information by scanning barcodes for containers, mail handling units, and single mail pieces
- Enhanced Barcode Diagnostics Application
- Employees can use their USPS mobile devices to scan barcodes to retrieve diagnostic data of the visible elements of the barcodes scanned and highlight invalid data elements

USPS is currently considering how to address long hauls.

## Addressing \& Geospatial Technology

## CASS / MASS Cycle O

Green \& Secure

## Informed Delivery

## Address Authority Data Exchange

## Cycle O-Highlights

Enhanced Identification of:

- PO Box only delivery ZIP Codes
" R777 phantom route \& "No-Stat" addresses
- Door Not Accessible, No Secure Location, \& Non-Delivery Days

Standardization \& DPV® confirmation of:

- PBSA - PO Box street address
- CMRA - PMB identifier \& DPV confirmation
- Single trailing alpha on a primary number
" New military addresses "OMC" \& "UMR"



## No-Stat Reason Codes

- The USPS® has added a new table to the DPV/DSF2Hash Product called No-Stat Reason Code Table.
- This table will provide details as to why the records are flagged as No-Stats.
- This table is optional and will be available beginning in the May product, which will be posted to the Electronic Product Fulfillment (EPF) website on Monday, April 23.
- During CASS ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ Cycle O certification if a ' $Y$ ' is received on the DPV No-Stat table, the N-Stat Reason code must be correctly returned.


## No-Stat Reason Code Definitions

| Reason Code | Code Description |
| :---: | :--- |
| $\mathbf{0}$ - Regular No-Stat | Indicates addresses not receiving delivery and the addresses are not <br> counted as possible deliveries. |
| $\mathbf{1 - I D A}$ (Internal Drop Address) | These are addresses that do not receive mail delivery directly from the <br> USPS, but are delivered to a drop address that services them. |
| $\mathbf{2 - C D S}$ No-Stat | These are addresses that have not yet become deliverable. For <br> example, a new subdivision where lots and primary numbers have <br> been determined, but no structure exists yet for occupancy. |
| $\mathbf{3 - C o l l i s i o n ~}$ | These addresses do not actually DPV confirm. In this case, the ' $Y$ ' <br> should be set to an ' $N$ ' on the DPV 'A' table and all other table values <br> should be blank. |
| $\mathbf{4 - C M Z ~ ( C o l l e g e , ~ M i l i t a r y ~}$ |  |
| and other types) | These are ZIP $+4 ®$ records USPS has incorporated into the data as <br> logical delivery points but not serviced directly by USPS. |

## DPV® Return Code Enhancements

Redefine DPV Codes to better indicate the reason an address did not produce a " $Y$ " return code.

## Current Definitions:

" $Y$ " - Address was DPV confirmed for both primary and (if present) secondary numbers
" $D$ " - Address was DPV confirmed for the primary number only and the secondary number is required but missing.
"S" - Address was DPV confirmed for the primary number. A secondary number was present but unconfirmed.

- (This led to confusion as whether a secondary was required or not.)


## New Definitions: (Codes to be determined)

"S" - Address had a secondary number that was not confirmed and was not needed with the primary address number.
"New'" - Address had a secondary number that was not confirmed but a valid secondary number was needed with the primary address number.
"New" " - Address was confirmed (ex: R777) but USPS mail delivery is not made to this address. ebruary 2018

## Tentative Schedule

CASS Cycle "O" Pre-Meeting
Partnership In Tomorrow (PIT) MeetingFebruary 232018May 12018
NCOA ${ }^{\text {Link }}$ PIT ..... May 82018
Official Rules Release ..... June 12018
Send Static Data
CASS \& NCOA ${ }^{\text {Link }}$ Stage I Release
CASS \& NCOA ${ }^{\text {Link }}$ Stage II Release
MASS Test Decks Available
CASS Developers Certification Completed
MASS Manufacturers Certification CompletedSoftware Released to End-users NLT
Expiration of CASS ${ }^{\top M}$ Cycle N
Implementation of CASS Cycle O
September 302018October 312018February 282019
September 302019
December 312019
January 312020March 312020
July 312020August 12020
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## Green \& Secure - Mail Disposition Options

## Intelligent Mail barcode is REQUIRED!

First-Class Mail ${ }^{\circledR}$

- Change Service Requested Option 1
- Change Service Requested Option 2
- Secure Destruction Service Option 1
- Secure Destruction Service Option 2

USPS Marketing Mail ${ }^{\circledR}$

- Change Service Requested Option 1
- Change Service Requested Option 2
(Forwarded USPS Marketing Mail Fees are charged for forwarded pieces)


## Option 1 recycles ALL UAA

Option 2 forwards if possible, recycles the rest
Secure Destruction shreds before recycling

## Informed Delivery 11-Digit Conflicts

## 11 -Digit De-conflicts

## Definition

Address records that are currently coded in the AMS database that share the same 11-digit delivery point. These addresses are currently ineligible for participation in the Informed Delivery program.

## Objective

Resolve the 11-digit conflicts to allow address records to become eligible to participate in the Informed Delivery program.


## Informed Delivery 11-Digit Conflicts

## 11-Digit De-conflicts Resolutions

## Option 1:

Crosswalk: Leverage existing geo-seg +4 even/odd ranges for the generation of a unique 11 -digit. It limits the use of available ZIP+4 and potential ZIP Code saturation. Also limits impact on address matching software.

## Option 2:

Convert records to a High-Rise; uniquely assigning a ZIP+4 to colliding deliveries. Potentially, $96 \%$ of the collisions can be corrected by using this method in conjunction with option 1.

## Option 3:

Create a derivative linkage table similar to LACS that will allow software to query the table to search for an equivalent but unique 11 -digit to be applied to the mail-piece. This method will be considered if necessary after options 1 and 2.

## Option 4:

No Resolution; conflict can'† be broken.

## Informed Delivery 11-Digit De-confliction

11-Digit De-conflicts Resolutions and Breakdown

| Resolution Description | Total | Capital Metro | Eastern | Great <br> Lakes | Northeast | Pacific | Southern | Western |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ZIP +4 Reassignment (Crosswalk) | 1,338,591 | 97,545 | 187,660 | 134,824 | 264,406 | 154,772 | 370,470 | 128,914 |
| AMS Coding Guidelines | 56,508 | 1,643 | 6,980 | 3,043 | 30,196 | 1,303 | 10,555 | 2,788 |
| Convert to a High-Rise Record | 2,936,756 | 128,983 | 650,235 | 368,037 | 1,301,085 | 136,348 | 208,809 | 143,259 |
| Can Not be De-Conflicted | 874,015 | 52,684 | 163,224 | 127,920 | 121,731 | 153,375 | 146,776 | 108,305 |

## Resolution By Area



## Informed Delivery 11-Digit De-confliction

## ZIP Codes with Highest Percentage of Conflicts

There are 64 ZIP Codes with 11-Digit Conflicts in the Chicago District. These ZIPs have the highest potential for implementing ZIP splits as a result of the de-conflicting effort if using the unique ZIP+4 assignment effort.


| Seven largest ZIP Codes with <br> Conflicts for Chicago District |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| ZIP CODE | TOTAL <br> CONFLICTS |
| 60618 | 13,814 |
| 60647 | 11,802 |
| 60625 | 9,632 |
| 60629 | 8,972 |
| 60639 | 8,757 |
| 60623 | 7,844 |
| 60619 | 7,729 |

## ZIP Codes with Highest Percentage of Conflicts

There are 159 ZIP Codes with 11-Digit Conflicts in the New York Metro Area. These ZIPs have the highest potential for implementing ZIP splits as a result of the de-conflicting effort if using the unique ZIP+4 is assignment effort.


Seven Largest ZIP Codes with Conflicts for New York Metro Area

| ZIP CODE | TOTAL <br> CONFLICTS |
| :---: | :---: |
| 11236 | 12,222 |
| 11234 | 9,141 |
| 11214 | 8,768 |
| 11221 | 7,321 |
| 11219 | 6,923 |
| 11208 | 6,575 |
| 11233 | 6,060 |
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## Address Authority Data Exchange

## Objective

Partner with the Department of Transportation, and their efforts, to create the National Address Database.

Compare address data received from the DOT National Address Database (NAD) to the USPS® Delivery Point File (DPF) database. Unmatched records will be researched and validated to be potentially added to AMS as a valid delivery point.


## Address Authority Data Exchange

## NAD Dała Breakdown Currently representing 13 States

Tołal Addresses Received from NAD 42,281,449

| with <br> DPF | DPF Match before AME and AEC | $30,965,575$ |
| :---: | :--- | ---: |
|  | DPF Match after AEC | $4,789,352$ |
|  | Total DPF | 949,918 |
| Match w/o <br> DPF | AME Match w/o DPF match | $36,704,845$ |
|  | AEC Match w/o DPF Match | $2,816,331$ |
|  | Total Match w/o DPF | 342,078 |
| No Match | AEC no match (could not resolve) | $\mathbf{3 , 1 5 8 , 4 0 9}$ |
|  | Bad Address (Missing ZIP and Address) | $2,418,195$ |

## Address Authority Data Exchange

## Phase I - ZIP + 4® Matches

Targeted $80 \%$ validation by 9/30

- Research and validate records that match a current ZIP + 4 range, but do not match to DPF

| Match w/o DPF: |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| AME Match w/o DPF match | $2,816,331$ |
| AEC Match w/o DPF Match | 342,078 |
| Total Match w/o DPF | $\mathbf{3 , 1 5 8 , 4 0 9}$ |

- Leverage enhanced geo coordinate to determine if an address match can be made.
- Unmatched records will be loaded into GMT for verification and acceptance into AMS by the local AMS office.
- 6 Districts are currently piloting the validation process to ensure records are received and being updated in AMS appropriately.
- Status updates will be provided monthly that shows how many records have been successfully added to the AMS database.


## MTAC Pulse of the Industry Service performance Measurement

## Mail In Measurement

Approach to Increasing Mail in Measurement

## Full Service Mail Trend

In December 2017, 92\% of Commercial mail eligible for Full-Service was Full-Service

Note: Below graph depicts FS Adoption \% as an avg. for the quarter; Slide title depicts the \% for the latest month.


## In FY18 Q1, over 78\% of Full-Service mail was in Measurement

| Mail Class | Mail Shape | Commercial | Full-Service Eligible | Full-Service | In Measurement | \% of Full-Service <br> In Measurement |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| First Class Presort | Letter/Card | 9,749,483,116 | 9,372,407,989 | 8,977,992,193 | 6,635,144,431 | 73.90\% |
| First Class Presort | Flat | 169,899,657 | 151,348,578 | 126,977,479 | 87,698,212 | 69.07\% |
| USPS Marketing | Letter | 14,499,209,464 | 14,209,168,816 | 13,338,299,049 | 11,056,692,101 | 82.89\% |
| USPS Marketing | Flat | 5,817,237,048 | 3,998,819,735 | 3,566,993,218 | 2,751,423,015 | 77.14\% |
| Periodicals | Flat | 1,250,121,841 | 1,206,914,247 | 1,093,896,536 | 755,828,711 | 69.10\% |
| Total |  | 31,485,951,126 | 28,938,659,365 | 27,104,158,475 | 21,286,786,470 | 78.54\% |

## M-in-M Network

" HQ Team

- SPM - Priyanka Misri, John Nabor, Wayne Palmiter
- Accenture - Beau Rauch, Lisa Leu
- Marketing - Chip Brown III (MMS), Frank Montemayor (BMS), Phillip Parrish (MEPT)
- Networks - Prat Shah
- Area Co-Coordinators (Mail Acceptance, Operations)
- CM - Danny Luc, Dmetrius Alexander
- EA - Barry Gilbert, Regis Curtin
- GL - Linda Bergeland, Drew Mason
- NE - Michelle Saracusa, Carla Edmonds
- PA - Claudia Munoz, Kelly Porter
- SO - Beth Baughman, Rick Bay
- WE - Ray Cordova, Jon Hummel


## Resolution Chronology

" 03/2017 to 07/2017 - identify top 3 exclusion reasons for each mail class/shape and HQ team investigate high volume site/mailer pairs for root cause and resolution

- 07/2018 - publish of HQ team results in Resolution Guide
- 08/2017 onward - investigate Field inquiries regarding published resolutions and update the Guide
- 11/2017 - complete L601 correction for LA, NJ, KC, and STL NDC's for Invalid EPFED
- 11/2017 - complete Southern Area STC correction to FDB locale key and CSA's for No Start-theClock
- 01/2018 - eliminate Incorrect Entry Facility exclusion
- 02/2018 - initiate Field collaborations as method to develop resolutions for unresolved exclusions
" 03/2018 - implement resolution for Seamless BMEU entry for No Start-the-Clock


## Field Communications

- 07/2018 - publish Improved SPM Exclusions webpage
- 08/2018 onward - initiate and continue national focus on exclusion volume and resolution efforts through monthly Area Co-Coordinator checkpoints. HQ team participate in Area facilitated District Co-Coordinator checkpoints.


## Field Tools

- 07/2018 - publish Resolution Guide for Commercial Mail Excluded from Measurement (on 4th revision)
- 07/2018 - improve SPM Exclusions by Area analysis files (on 3rd revision)


## Current Resolution Efforts

- Ongoing - Field analysis of exclusions and application of resolutions w/ HQ team support
- 02/2018 - Field apply new resolution for SCF entry mail entered at co-located BMEU
- 02/2018 - HQ/Field collaboration w/ Omaha P\&DC and North Texas P\&DC to develop resolutions for Inconsistent SPM Data and No Piece Scan exclusions for letters
- 02/2018 - initiate investigation into No Piece Scan exclusion for BPM


## Results

- Mail in Measurement by FY: FY16 = 71.73\%, FY17 $=74.88 \%$, FY 18 YTD $=78.50 \%$
- 04/2017 - initiate I-MR charts to track monthly \% included by mail class/shape
- 01/2018 - initiate national chart to track FY \% and volume included by mail class/shape



District Exclusion Results (YTD Dec)


FY Trends - National (YTD Dec)


## Service Diagnostics

| First Mile |  | Origin Processing |  | Transit |  | Destination Processing |  |  |  | Unable to Assign | Last Mile |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Area |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| WESTERN |  | $\wedge$ | EASTERN | ヘ | SOUTHERN | ヘ | SOUTHERN |  | ヘ | SOUTHERN | ヘ | PACIFIC | $\uparrow$ |
| EASTERN |  |  | GREAT LAKES |  | GREAT LAKES |  | NORTHEAST |  |  | GREAT LAKES |  | CAPITAL METRO |  |
| SOUTHERN |  |  | SOUTHERN |  | WEStERN |  | WESTERN |  |  | EASTERN |  | NORTHEAST |  |
| NORTHEAST |  |  | WESTERN |  | NORTHEAST |  | CAPITAL METRO |  |  | WESTERN |  | EASTERN |  |
| CAPITAL METRO |  | $\checkmark$ | CAPITAL METRO | $\checkmark$ | EAStERN | $\checkmark$ | GREAT LAKES |  | $\checkmark$ | NORTHEAST | $\checkmark$ | WESTERN | $\checkmark$ |
| 0．00\％ | 1．00\％ |  | 0．00\％0．43\％ |  | 0．00\％8．78\％ |  | 0．00\％ | 2．14\％ |  | 0．00\％2．50\％ |  | 0．00\％ $6.62 \%$ |  |
| District |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| KENTUCKIANA |  | $\wedge$ | LAKELAND | ヘ | SOUTH FLORIDA | $\wedge$ | SOUTH FLORIDA |  | $\wedge$ | SUNCOAST | $\wedge$ | LOS ANGELES | $\wedge$ |
| ARIZONA |  |  | KENTUCKIANA |  | CENTRAL ILIINOIS |  | houston |  |  | CENTRAL ILLINOIS |  | LAKELAND |  |
| MID－AMERICA |  |  | CAPITAL |  | HOUSTON |  | LAKELAND |  |  | KENTUCKIANA |  | SAN FRANCISCO |  |
| HOUSTON |  |  | PHILADELPHIA METROPO |  | GULF ATLANTIC |  | ARIZONA |  |  | LAKELAND |  | NEWYORK |  |
| SOUTH FLORIDA |  | $\checkmark$ | MID－AMERICA | $\checkmark$ | NORTHERN NEW JERSEY | $\checkmark$ | CAPITAL |  | $\checkmark$ | NORTHLAND | $\checkmark$ | PHILADELPHIA METROPO | $\checkmark$ |
| 0．00\％ | 0．69\％ |  | 0．00\％0．27\％ |  | 0．00\％ $2.68 \%$ |  | 0．00\％ | 0．91\％ |  | 0．00\％1．28\％ |  | 0．00\％2．23\％ |  |
| Plant |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOUISVILLE |  | $\wedge$ | MILWAUKEE PRIORITY ANNE．． | $\wedge$ | CHICAGO NDC | $\wedge$ | ROYAL PALM |  | $\wedge$ | YBOR CITY | $\wedge$ | LOS ANGELES | $\wedge$ |
| KANSAS CITY NDC |  |  | LOUISVILLE |  | ROYAL PALM |  | NORTH HOUSTON |  |  | CHICAGO NDC |  | SAN FRANCISCO |  |
| NORTH HOUSTON |  |  | WASHINGTON NDC |  | NORTH HOUSTON |  | WEST VALLEY |  |  | LOUISVILLE |  | NEW YORK |  |
| WEst valley |  |  | PHILADELPHIA NDC |  | MINNEAPOLIS SAINT PAUL ．．． | RICHMOND |  |  | FORT MYERS |  | MLLWAUKEE PRIORITY ANNE．．． |  |  |
| NORFOLK |  | $\checkmark$ | KANSAS CITY NDC | $\checkmark$ | LoulsVille | $\checkmark$ | Chicago |  | $\checkmark$ | MILWAUKEE PRIORITY ANNE．．． | $\checkmark$ | PHILADELPHIA | $\checkmark$ |
| 0．00\％ | 0．65\％ |  | 0．00\％0．26\％ |  | 0．00\％ $2.10 \%$ |  | 0．00\％ | 0．86\％ |  | 0．00\％0．64\％ |  | 0．00\％2．21\％ |  |

Lane

| $530 \mathrm{PC} \propto$ ¢ 750 |  | ヘ | $773 ¢ 773$ |  | $\wedge$ | 330PM $<3330 \mathrm{PM}$ |  | $\wedge$ | $3350 C \times 335 D C$ |  | $\wedge$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 530 PC ¢ 190 |  |  | 330PM×330РM |  |  | $773 \times 773$ |  |  | $60 Z \bigcirc 339$ |  |  |
| 010PM $>012$ |  |  | 950¢＞956 |  |  | $85 \mathrm{HC}>85 \mathrm{H}$ |  |  | 60Z $\bigcirc 335 \mathrm{DC}$ |  |  |
| $530 \mathrm{PC} \propto 752$ |  |  | 078×07z |  |  | $230<230$ |  |  | 20Zos39 |  |  |
| $530 \mathrm{PC} \propto 380$ |  | $\checkmark$ | 90Z $<890$ |  | $\checkmark$ | $608>806$ |  | $\checkmark$ | $495 A X \diamond 495 A X$ |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 0．00\％ | 0．01\％ |  | 0．00\％ | 0．78\％ |  | 0．00\％ | 0．41\％ |  | 0．00\％ | 0．19\％ |  |

## Enterprise Analytics Service Performance

USPS Marketing Mail®

USPS Marketing Mail® FY 13 thru FY 18 Performance


USPS Marketing Mail® Destination Entry FY 13 to FY 18 Performance By Quarter


Note: DDU-Entry = Two Day, DSCF = Three-To-Five-Day, DNDC = Five-Day-And-Above

## Enterprise Analytics Service Performance

USPS Marketing Mail®
Letters



| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Q2TD thru } \\ & \text { 1/26/18 } \end{aligned}$ | Total Pieces Measured | Processing On-Time | Last Mile Impact | Overall Score | Target Score | SPLY Pieces Measured | Volume Change | SPLY Overall QTD Score | SPLY <br> Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SCF Letters | 2,240,565,374 | 90.27\% | -2.25\% | 88.02\% | 91.80\% | 2,248,485,390 | -0.35\% | 94.82\% | -6.80\% |
| NDC Letters | 317,843,276 | 90.59\% | -1.57\% | 89.02\% | 91.80\% | 294,884,613 | 7.79\% | 94.26\% | -5.24\% |
| E2E Letters | 285,617,632 | 59.03\% | -1.08\% | 57.95\% | 91.80\% | 274,037,583 | 4.23\% | 64.49\% | -6.54\% |
| 3-Day | 52,631,343 | 82.16\% | -1.43\% | 80.73\% | 91.80\% | 55,207,392 | -4.67\% | 87.29\% | -6.57\% |
| 4-Day | 2,126,281 | 88.85\% | -1.03\% | 87.82\% | 91.80\% | 1,704,928 | 24.71\% | 87.29\% | 0.53\% |
| 5-Day | 41,169,885 | 78.37\% | -1.23\% | 77.14\% | 91.80\% | 36,199,401 | 13.73\% | 81.48\% | -4.34\% |
| 6-10 Day | 182,490,480 | 47.33\% | -0.96\% | 46.37\% | 91.80\% | 173,683,027 | 5.07\% | 53.40\% | -7.02\% |
| 11+ Day | 7,199,643 | 67.04\% | -0.86\% | 66.18\% | 91.80\% | 7,242,835 | -0.60\% | 66.53\% | -0.35\% |
| Total | 2,844,026,282 |  |  | 83.99\% | 91.80\% | 2,817,407,586 | 0.94\% | 90.85\% | -6.86\% |

## Last Mile Impact Trend



Q2TD DSCF and DNDC Marketing Letters scores would be above 97.06\% (prior to last mile), if pieces that failed by 1 day passed


## Enterprise Analytics Service Performance

USPS Marketing Mail®
Flats

USPS Marketing Mail® FY13 to FY 18 Performance



| $\begin{gathered} \text { Q2TD thru } \\ \text { 1/26/18 } \end{gathered}$ | Total Pieces Measured | Processing On-Time | Last Mile Impact | Overall Score | Target Score | SPLY Pieces Measured | Volume Change | SPLY Overall QTD Score | SPLY <br> Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SCF Flats | 476,645,768 | 93.57\% | -9.80\% | 83.77\% | 91.80\% | 488,176,337 | -2.36\% | 89.25\% | -5.48\% |
| NDC Flats | 82,583,390 | 91.61\% | -7.32\% | 84.29\% | 91.80\% | 64,774,274 | 27.49\% | 89.36\% | -5.07\% |
| E2E Flats | 49,368,283 | 51.93\% | -5.18\% | 46.75\% | 91.80\% | 44,593,878 | 10.71\% | 53.70\% | -6.95\% |
| 3-Day | 6,425,074 | 75.64\% | -8.06\% | 67.58\% | 91.80\% | 5,457,800 | 17.72\% | 69.30\% | -1.72\% |
| 4-Day | 166,982 | 77.08\% | -5.63\% | 71.45\% | 91.80\% | 208,423 | -19.88\% | 78.34\% | -6.89\% |
| 5-Day | 5,436,981 | 65.34\% | -6.18\% | 59.16\% | 91.80\% | 4,995,016 | 8.85\% | 66.21\% | -7.05\% |
| 6-10 Day | 35,781,475 | 44.86\% | -4.48\% | 40.38\% | 91.80\% | 32,110,235 | 11.43\% | 47.78\% | -7.40\% |
| 11+ Day | 1,557,771 | 67.17\% | -6.24\% | 60.93\% | 91.80\% | 1,822,404 | -14.52\% | 74.28\% | -13.36\% |
| Total | 608,597,441 |  |  | 80.06\% | 91.80\% | 597,544,489 | 1.85\% | 85.62\% | -5.56\% |
| FSS Zone* | 129,477,600 | 86.07\% | -4.95\% | 81.12\% | 91.80\% | 122,970,736 | 5.29\% | 86.22\% | -5.11\% |
| Non-FSS Zone* | 479,119,841 | 90.01\% | -10.04\% | 79.97\% | 91.80\% | 466,466,195 | 2.71\% | 85.47\% | -5.50\% |

[^2]
## Last Mile Impact Trend



## Destination-Entry Last Mile Impact



Note: Service performance measurement was suspended for mail originating from or destined to Caribbean District in FY18 Q1 and Q2 due to the devastating impacts of Hurricanes Irma and Maria.
Mail destined to FSS Zone and Non-FSS Zone is determined based on L006 Labeling List, excluding EDDM and Saturation Mail.

## End-to-End Last Mile Impact



Note: Service performance measurement was suspended for mail originating from or destined to Caribbean District in FY18 Q1 and Q2 due to the devastating impacts of Hurricanes Irma and Maria.
Mail destined to FSS Zone and Non-FSS Zone is determined based on L006 Labeling List, excluding EDDM and Saturation Mail.

## Overall Last Mile Impact



Note: Service performance measurement was suspended for mail originating from or destined to Caribbean District in FY18 Q1 and Q2 due to the devastating impacts of Hurricanes Irma and Maria.
Mail destined to FSS Zone and Non-FSS Zone is determined based on L006 Labeling List, excluding EDDM and Saturation Mail.

Q2TD DSCF and DNDC Marketing Flats scores would be above 95.84\% (prior to last mile), if pieces that failed by 1 day passed


Thank You!

## Appendix

## IMpb Compliance Visualization Dashboard Demo

Explore the possibility of providing a way for mailers to see quality metrics through a D3? Visualization:

- The current visualization will display a summary of the monthly IMpb Compliance Indicators (AQ, MQ, \& BQ)
- Mailers will be able to drill down to view compliance data at a state level which highlights IMpb compliance issues by geographic location
http://56.72.7.32:9100/YK/Project VII/versio
n 20180222/app/


## IMPB DASHBOARD DEMO


[^0]:    Service performance measurement was suspended for mail originating from or destined to Caribbean District in FY18 Q2 due to the devastating impacts of Hurricanes Irma and Maria

[^1]:    Service performance measurement was suspended for mail originating from or destined to Caribbean District in FY18 Q2 due to the devastating impacts of Hurricanes Irma and Maria

[^2]:    Feb Service performance measurement was suspended for mail originating from or destined to Caribbean District in FY18 Q2 due to the devastating impacts of Hurricanes Irma and Maria. * Mail destined to FSS Zone and Non-FSS Zone is determined based on L006 Labeling List, excluding EDDM and Saturation Mail. SPLY FSS and Non-FSS Zone scores and volumes are calculated using cleansed end of quarter data, while rest of SPLY data was based on pre-cleansed data.

