

MTAC WG 195 –
Enterprise Payment System (EPS)
Review and Enhancements

Closeout – July 26, 2022

MTAC WG 195 LEADERSHIP & MEMBERS

Industry Co-Leader: Wanda Senne, DHL eCommerce Solutions – Mgr., Postal Affairs & Postage Management

Industry Co-Leader: John Whittington, Intelisent - Sr. Manager Business Solutions

Postal Co-Leader: James Duffy, Mgr. Commercial Product Prep & Payment

Postal Co-Leader: Geriann Wakely, Commercial Acceptance Analyst III

Postal Co-Leader: Crystal Newman, Software Architect III

Members: 83 participants from over 30 companies and the USPS representing every group in the mail supply chain – mail owners, printers, comminglers, transportation, software developers, tracking providers, and other interested parties.

MTAC WG 195 ISSUE STATEMENT

USPS proposes identifying multiple issues and solutions to address the data and reporting needs of the mailing industry. There are several business needs that have been identified by the mailing industry that will require better/modified connectivity between the Enterprise Payment System, its data sources, and other USPS systems.

This includes Informed Visibility, Mail Tracking and Reporting, and the Package Platform.

Feedback has been provided and tracked through specific mailing industry points of contact.

MTAC WG 195 DESIRED RESULTS

- Enhanced EPS payment data, retrieval, and reporting for the Mailing Industry from the EPS platform
- Informed Visibility Platform to review:
 - Data Contents
 - Data Frequency
 - Data Timeliness
 - Data Layout
 - User Interface
- Enhance user experience of the EPS platform
- CAPS to EPS Migration – Not part of the Issue Statement but was an original focus of the group to remove obstacles preventing mailers from moving to EPS

MTAC WG 195 PARTICIPATION & FORMAT

- Weekly meetings beginning in December 2020
- 152 EPS concerns consolidated and triaged from:
 - WG 173 – Original EPS WG
 - UG 11 EPS related issues
 - EPS related tickets
 - Other EPS concerns submitted by different Industry members
- 69 issues remained after identifying some as completed, closed, or no longer relevant
- 85 issues total was the final number after identifying more during the course of the WG

MTAC WG 195 ISSUES LIST

Complete document filed with recommendations

Issue #	Issue Origin	Category	Sub-Category	Date Raised	Raised By	ALM/CR/IM C#	Issue Summary	WG 195 Notes	Recommendation	Priority	Status
5	Pre-WG 195 Industry-20	Correction needed	EPS Improvement		John W.	4940072 ALM #13986 ALM #14267 5667677	No Bundle, Sacks, or Pallet counts in the PP file. 11/16/20: After release on 11/15, bundle, pallet, and sack counts are coming through but as whole numbers. They are rounding (up and down) the actual counts that appear on the postage statement and in PO!	01/07/2021: Per EPC/PPC, 14267 will bring the container count back into the file with the fractional precision. The changes were overwritten during our last release. 1/14/21: Container count issue fix deployed on 1/10/2021 but could not be verified if the fix was corrected on the call. (After the WG call, the counts with decimal places was verified from Intelisize.) - 2/25/21: After checking more files the 1/10/21 release is not complete. Crystal to follow up with Phalgun 3/2/21: John W. sent example 4/22/21: Should be fixed in the 4/25 release 4/30/2021: John W. Works as expected	None needed. Fixed while WG 195 was active.	High	Fixed
6	Pre-WG 195 Industry-24	Feature Request	CAPS Transition			5242786	Customer Reference ID not displaying in EPS but it used to in CAPS for Stamped mailing.	2/25/21: Needs to be reviewed - John W. to provide more examples. Phil B. added that it might be there. He is checking and will advise. 3/2/21: John W. sent example 3/4/21: Crystal to follow up with Phil B. 4/8/21: USPS email from 3/23: The Customer Reference ID area in the EPS Commercial Mailing and Shipping report is functioning as it should. I checked with several customers that I know use this and they are having no issues. Industry still needs to discuss this in the WG. It is not working for everyone. 4/22/21: Customer Reference ID not displaying in EPS like it does in CAPS for Stamped Mailings; additional details are not sent for refunds and adjustments so this is how it is supposed to function; Industry needs a reference to explain the charges; adjustments should be better organized; USPS will take this back as a recommendation to look at it and provide feedback; wants more fields to explain this; Lisa W. brought up another issue from a previous WG from Jan 2020; would like to know if this is the same/similar issue; there might be a related CR 10/7/21: USPS - Customer Reference ID is displayed in the "Detail" column of the EPS Transaction History Report, for mailing transactions. Industry clarified that the problem is specific for Stamped mailings. Discussion also around how the Detail field is being used differently depending upon the type of mailing. In the Data fields document, listed a suggestion to keep the Customer Reference ID in its own column. USPS to follow up. 10/28/21: Still needs follow up. 1/6/22: USPS Currently under review 2/11/22: USPS to consider adding to IV-MTR as part of the Transaction History/Commercial Mailing & Shipping Details Reports. Concerns - System Impacts? For the stamped mailings not having Customer Reference ID, I think John provided some examples to Phalgun. I'm not sure if he was able to determine why those do not have a value. In terms of potentially adding an additional column to Transaction History specific for Customer Reference ID, I think we need to consider that as part of the broader requested updates to Transaction History/Commercial Mailing & Shipping Details Reports. 2/13/22: Examples resent to USPS 2/23/22: USPS: We would have to add functionality to send additional details for non-postage statement/returns invoices to EPS. 6/8/22 Meeting: No update at this time.	Move issue to UG 11	Medium	Needs USPS Follow-up
17	Pre-WG 195 Industry-43	Feature Request	Data Delegation				eDoc submitter able to create EPS data delegation for statements they can access as the eDoc submitter in PO	2/25/21: Still needed from the Industry. 3/4/21: Discussed forming a Data Delegation Subgroup. Todd B. clarified that the request does not have to mean the eDoc submitters are allowed in the program area of EPS. Steve J. from IV indicated this could be a huge change/effort for IV MTR. Other MSP companies advised that this would be a valuable feature for them. 3/11/21: USPS shared they would not be focusing on a data delegation subgroup effort at this time. Industry is still in favor of working the Data Delegation issues whether in the main group or a subgroup. An idea was floated to possibly move the "Showstopper" issues to a separate Task Team to allow more time in this WG for the other issues. Rose F. followed up with MTAC leadership. There is not a plan to create a new TT at this time. 6/8/22 Meeting: Prior to WG 195 sunseting, the plan is to restart the sub-group for Data Delegation. After the sunseting, the group will continue under UG 11 as a Sub-group or Task Team.	Postage Data Delegation moving to a new MTAC Task Team.	Medium	New Task Team
32	UG11 UnSchedul	Feature Request	EPS Improvement	03/05/20		1639	CR 1639 - Add refund reason for refund transactions	1/28/21: Still needed; Lisa Wurman advised that it is still an action item from the January 2020 MTAC; David Stover said it was an issue when UHG tries to reconcile 8/26/21: No implementation date yet. Still being prioritized. USPS will return with a schedule date in September.	Monitor until completed in UG 11	High	Prioritized for 2nd Half of FY22 (April-Sept 2022)

MTAC WG 195 FOCUS AREAS

- Transitioning remaining CAPS mailers to EPS
- Improving EPS System performance by developing SLAs and system enhancements
- Improve Postage Data Delegation
 - Allowing eDoc submitters to receive their postage data through IV
 - Adding more levels of delegation for EPS CRID owners
- Enhancing postage data availability by increasing the fields on the EPS platform and within the IV-EPS files
- Identifying and correcting existing problems and limitations within the EPS platform and EPS-IV data

MTAC WG 195 SUMMARY OF 85 ISSUES

- 28 closed due to no longer being a problem or no industry interest to pursue further
- 26 fixed during the course of the WG
- 6 scheduled to be fixed in a 2022 release
- 1 to be scheduled in a future release
- 11 related to adding data fields in the EPS platform and the EPS-IV files
- 4 related to postage data delegation
- 9 waiting on a USPS response

MTAC WG 195 RECOMMENDATIONS

- Data Delegation – Due to the complexity and interest in improving postage data delegation, Task Team 36 was formed
- Data field improvements in EPS Platform and EPS-IV files
 - All recommendations to enhance the EPS-IV files were approved and will be monitored in UG 11 until completion
 - Recommendations to add functionality to the EPS platform were table due to cost
- Issues scheduled and “to be scheduled” will be monitored in UG 11 until completion
- 28 issues closed and 26 fixed – no recommendation needed however on two of the closed issues there are two suggestions
 - Clarification to documentation should occur to avoid confusion regarding refunds and reversals
 - USPS Alerts regarding EPS/IV should always be generated if there is any potential impact to Industry
- 9 issues waiting on a USPS response will be worked in UG 11

MTAC WG 195 PROPOSED DELEGATION MATRIX

Complete document filed with recommendations

		C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	X	Y
Business Entity	EPS CRID Level	Delegate Visibility	EPS Account Level	Delegate Visibility	EPS Permit	Delegate Visibility	Mail Preparer	Delegate Visibility	Edoc Submitter	Delegate Visibility	Mail Owner	Delegate Visibility	PO! Permit	Delegate Visibility	MMA CRID	Delegate Visibility								
	Receive		Receive		Receive		Receive		Receive		Receive		Receive		Receive									
EPS World	EPS CRID Owner	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A							
	Delegate	X	NO	X	NO	X	NO	X	NO	X	NO	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A							
	EPS Account Owner	N/A	N/A	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A							
	Delegate	N/A	N/A	X	NO	X	NO	X	NO	X	NO	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A							
Mail.Dat/MailXML By/For World	Mail Owner	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A							
	Delegate	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A							
	eDoc Submitter	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$	x	X	x	X	x	N/A	N/A							
	Delegate	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	x	NO	x	NO	x	NO	N/A	N/A							
	Mail Preparer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	X	?	N/A	N/A	X	?	X	?	N/A	N/A							
	Delegate	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	?	NO	N/A	N/A	?	NO	?	NO	N/A	N/A							
Legacy BCG Roles	CRID MMA BSA?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	NO	NO	NO	NO							
	Delegate	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	NO	NO	NO	NO							

Commingler Pricing Model or Agency

Light Blue = Exists Today
 Green = Access
 N/A = Access Not Applicable/Attainable to this type of Business Entity
 NO = Access could be made available from an architecture standpoint but denied for business reasons.
 Yellow = In question/To be discussed

MTAC WG 195 QUESTIONS

