## STANDARDS BOARD

Paris, 11 July 2006

### Draft Report

1    The 2006.3 Standards Board meeting was held in Paris on 11 July 2006. The list of participants is provided in Annexe 1. The main conclusions of the meeting are listed below. An action point list appears at the end of this report showing all the points on which action by a particular party is expected.

### I.    Opening of meeting and adoption of agenda
POC SB 2006.3–Doc 1.Rev 1

2    The agenda was adopted without amendment.

### II.   Report of last meeting
POC SB 2005.3–Report

3    The report of the last meeting was accepted as presented.

4    Except for the following, all action items were either completed or on the 2006.3 agenda:

| Action No. | Action | Action by |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | Submit S40-4 to ANSI and SC31 and CEN | IPC |
| 4 | Investigate the possibility of an Union Postale article on M38, International Money Orders | IB |
| 5 | Work out more details about the issues raised by La Poste (use of F1 area) | ID-tag WG |
| 8 | Provide the 2006.3 SB meeting with a progress report on Mandatory standards – references, availability and translations | IB |
| 13 | Conduct a survey of existing IMPCs to be carried out by IB in the second semester of 2006, asking them to provide the necessary data to populate the additional column in code list 108 | IB |
| 16 | Collaborative work between PEB and the working group should be done to work out the proposed editorial changes to finalise S43 | PEB/EPS Group |
| 17 | Publish S43 - Editorial changes must be made changing "Electronic PostMark" to "electronic postmark" in the entire document, except for HTML files or the beginning of sentences (that would be Electronic postmark) and deleting the postmark image example on page 25 | PEB/IB |

| Action No. | Action | Action by |
|---|---|---|
| 18 | Document a proposal to modify the Standards Approval Process so that it will be possible to withdraw status 2 standards without necessarily needing to get this endorsed by the POC plenary. This proposal should be presented to the next SB meeting in July | IB |
| 24 | Draft a paper an evaluation of actions that should be taken to increase the level of cooperation. This will involve other UPU bodies as well as different organisational units within the UPU/IB | IB |

### III.  Reports on activities

#### a    *Data and Code Definition Group*
POC SB DCG 2006.2–Report

5    The 2006.2 DCG report was presented by Royal Mail. The full DCG report can be found on the UPU website. The next meeting will be held in Montreal on 13/14/15 September 2006 (meeting schedule to be finalised).

6    Royal Mail advised that the DCG had done some initial investigation of the subject of Aggregate Mailstream Segregation codes in light of the previous SB direction to conduct a survey of all IMPCs. This initial investigation shows that there does not appear to be a business requirement for application of these codes at this time. However the DCG will continue to study the issue and report back to the SB.

#### b    *Electronic Exchange Group*
POC SB EXG 2006.2–Report

7    The 2006.2 EXG report was presented by Royal Mail. The full report can be found on the UPU website. The next meeting will be held in Montreal on 13/14/15 September 2006 (meeting schedule to be finalised).

#### c    *Physical Exchange Group*
POC SB PEG 2006.2–Report

8    The 2006.2 PEG report was presented by the USPS. The full report can be accessed on the UPU website. The next meeting will be held in Montreal on 13/14/15 September 2006 (meeting schedule to be finalised).

#### d    *IATA/UPU Group on EDI Issues*
POC SB IATA–UPU 2006.1–Report

9    The 2006.1 IATA/UPU report was presented by Royal Mail. The full report can be found on the UPU website. The next meeting is scheduled on 11 October 2006, in Berne.

#### e    *Customs Data Interchange Group*
POC SB CDIG 2006.1–Report

10   The 2006.1 CDIG report was presented by Royal Mail. The full report can be found on the UPU website. The next meeting was scheduled for 12 October 2006 (the day after the IATA/UPU meeting).

#### f    *CEN TC 331*

11   CEN presented an update on TC 331 activities. It was explained that only by September CEN will advise whether EN 14412 can be replaced by S42a–5. The meeting to decide on this issue is going to be scheduled on Solystic's premises on 5 September 2006. All parties interested in this subject are welcome to participate.

12    CEN is waiting for the completion of tests of M36a Part A: General concepts and attribute definitions to address and close CEN WI 331027.

13    The USPS informed that CEN WI: 331028 – Postal services – ID-tagging image encoding there is no need to continue open as talking among some postal administrations has indicated that there is no business driver and this could be opened later, if necessary.

14    Formal vote has been launched to Postal services – Customer directed information including T&T – General concepts and definitions and Statement of mailing submission and Open interface from machine control to bar code printers.

15    Following a question raised by CEN, IB informed that S43 – Electronic PostMark (EPM) interface was approved at the 2006.2 SB meeting; however some editorial adjustments are being made. IPC indicated that this work would be finished by the end of September at latest.

16    CEN added that they are about to conclude an update on their new standard version on complaints and that this version will be more compact and client-oriented. The next meeting was scheduled on 19 October 2006, in Rome.

### g    Addressing Project Group TC

17    The report of the last meeting was presented by the USPS delegate. USPS advised that the Addressing Project Group has taken the responsibility to prepare electronic means to exchange addressing information, in conjunction with EXG.

### IV.    UPU standards updates and progress reports

### a    S18 ID-tagging of letter mail item (Parts B, D and E) – update proposal
POC SB 2006.3–Doc 4a

18    In approving the last version of S18d, S18d-7, the Standards Board noted that the specification contained a definition of flats which differed from that in the Standards glossary and requested that this be clarified. The ID-tag working group has agreed that, to accommodate this request, the glossary should be revised and the definitions of flat and small letter should be removed from S18d and amended in the glossary (covered in agenda item 4c). The ID-tag working group has also now completed its work on the development of a specification for a 4-state routing code (S48) designed for use in association with S18e ID-tags. Some changes to S18e are required to support such combined use. In undertaking the work on the development of S48, it was pointed out that S18b could be interpreted as recommending the use of inks that might not be compliant with health and safety regulations in some countries. The ID-tag working group proposed to modify S18b to remove this implication, The Standard board was asked to approve draft updates of S18–b, d and e without changing their status.

19    The IB asked IPC if there is some expectation that Status 0 joint standards not have frequent updates. CEN approval goes through similar process as in the IB. Therefore, any modification to those standards has to be recommended and voted by CEN and so should be avoided. IPC explained that S18a has been stable for a long time, however, it was modified in function that some wording in that standard could be misinterpreted. This sentence requires restructure.

20    La Poste, FR, pointed out in S18d that, in areas F4 or F4X designed for ID-tag, the permitted use of labels would be a real issue for importing country because address could be overlapped by the labels preventing a mechanised process. For information, many flats in France have an address within area of 55 mm from the bottom.

21    Subject to the comments made by La Poste, FR, the SB agreed to return this issue to ID-Tag working group to review and propose a solution for resubmission of S18d to SB for approval. (AP:ID TagWG).

22    The SB endorsed the proposed update to S18 Parts B and E for publishing. (AP:IB/PEB)

23    Due to the issue raised by La Post regarding the need of being granted Status 0 to S48 and S49 and considering that those standards had not being numbered as such by the time of their approval, at the March meeting, the SB recognized that Status 0 to S48 and S49 is granted (respectively derived from work items P26 and P17b). The International Bureau acknowledged that next standards derived from work items should be presented to the SB with their actual sequential standard number provided by the IB secretariat.

**b    P27 4-state routing code – Status 0 request**
POC SB 2006.3–Doc 4b

24    The working item P27 – 4-state routing code deals with a specification for a 4-state routing code which can be printed, in area F1 on small letters, on items with an S18e-compliant ID-tag printed in another part of the same area. The placement was modified as requested by Australia Post. The ID-tag working group endorsed by the PEG developed a draft specification and requested the SB to grant Status 0 to the annexed document and close the referred work item.

25    The IB noted that the policy that has been followed by the SB regarding the approval of Status 0 is that there should be a minimum of 2 postal administrations involved in testing/implementing the standard. If there are any cases that a standard with status 0 has not fulfilled this recommendation, the SB might be reviewing or monitoring those cases to achieve this requirement. So far, only Sweden Post has committed to testing P27.

26    IPC believes that it evolved from standards that are already in place therefore resources were available to work on the matter and it was found valuable. It suggested adopting the standard while still preserving the process of being tested for two postal organizations.

27    La Poste, FR, asked to verify if the place reserved for routing code is able to accept extension information. UPU issuer code might be missing.

28    After extensive discussions, it was agreed to send this issue back to the ID-Tag Working Group to find another country to commit the test and postpone this item until the 2006.4 SB meeting, in Berne. (AP: ID-Tag WG).

**c    UPU standards glossary – update proposal**
POC SB 2006.3–Doc 4c

29    The UPU standards glossary defines a number of terms, acronyms, symbols and abbreviations which are used in other UPU standards. The definitions concerned are placed therein, rather than in the individual standards concerned, in order to avoid unnecessary duplication and, by having one definition instead of several, to avoid the risk of divergence between different definitions which might accompany such duplication. In approving S18d–7 ID-tagging of letter mail items – Part D: 4-state encoding specification for flats, the Standards Board noted that the specification contained a definition of flats which differed from that in the Standards glossary and requested that this be clarified. Following a review of the document by the ID-tag working group, PEG and DCG, except for the definition of "mail unit", the SB was requested to approve the changes to the Standards glossary.

30    La Poste, FR, remarked that the first sentence of the NOTE on the definition of Code 39 (on page 5 of Doc 4c Annexe 1) was not accurate. It is believed that code 39 can represent more than 39 different characters. La Poste objected to definition of flat based on the equipment instead of dimensions. IPC explained that definition of flat based in dimensions is different in different countries because of the infrastructure for treating objects therefore the solution found was dependent on the flat sorters used by the delivery Post.

31    IPC agreed that the solution for definition of flat has improved but is not yet ideal and it should be worked out when next updates take place.

32    The SB approved the updated to the glossary for publishing, adjusting NOTE on Code 39 according to La Poste remarks. (AP: IB/PEB)

**d    S19 Encoding envelopes – placement area definitions – split into parts – update proposal**
POC SB 2006.3–Doc 4d

33    S19 Encoding on envelopes – Placement area definitions provides a definition of encoding areas on letter mail items. Following a request of the Standards Board, it was divided into 4 parts. Drafts for Parts A (General concepts and definition of the coordinate system), B (Areas used by postal handling organisations for the encoding of information) and C (Areas used for postmarks, indicia and service endorsements) are provided with Doc 4d and Part D (Areas used for addresses and for customer encoding printed together with the delivery address) remains to be developed. The SB was requested to approve the specifications being accorded Status 1 for S19a and S19b and Status O for S19c.

34    There was discussion related to address location issues raised by La Poste. USPS reckoned that locating addressing in a flat is a measure issue and there is no consensus where it would be the best part on the envelope to place it. IPC added that in some cases the address is put on a loose label inside the envelope and in this way the address can move anywhere inside the flat.

35    The SB approved the granting of status 1 to S19a and S19b and Status 0 to S19c, for publishing (AP:IB/PEB) and requested PEG to address S19d to the next SB meeting. (AP:PEG)

**e    M33 Postal item attributes and the communication of item information – and all related messaging specifications to support customs data interchange requirements – update proposal**
POC SB 2006.3–Doc 4e

36    The messaging standard M33 – Postal item attributes and the communication of item information (and all related: M30 to M36) defines useful attributes and specifies mechanisms for the communication of their values in electronic messages between postal handling organizations.

37    Building on the experience gained in the SAMPLE project, the MEDICI Mails Electronic Data Interchange & Customs Integration project at early stage was based on the implementation of an operational platform for the communication of data needed for customs declaration purposes. Work on the first phase of the project, aimed at the exchange of data which is captured through on-line shipping systems, effectively commenced in January 2006. Subject to the results obtained, later phases will extend the scope to cover the exchange of data captured through mailer-post EDI systems and data captured by the origin post.

38    After extensive discussions, the project has reached agreement in principle on the use of the ITMATT message, defined in UPU standard M33, as the basis for data interchange between the posts. The customs data content of this message was based on UPU message specification M28, which resulted from work on the SAMPLE project. This in turn was based on an old version of CN 22 and CN 23 and, as documented in POC SB CDIG 2005-2 Doc 5 (Annexe 2 of Doc 4e), had a number of deficiencies.

39    To redress these deficiencies, the project participants have defined the changes, necessary to M33c and related specifications, which will be implemented in the first phase of the MEDICI project. These changes are documented in the attached annexes. The SB was requested to approve the proposed changes.

40    Based on comments from La Poste, the SB noted that the document was done primarily for the MEDICI Project and can be updated for the future.

41    The SB approved the modifications documented in the annexes 3 to 9 (M30b, M31, M32a; M32b, M33a M33b and M33c) without status changes, for publishing. (AP: IB/PEB)

***f      M17 EMSEVT Message specification, Version 0 – progress report***

42      The IB presented the status of work done in the EXG concerning a change in M17 (EMSEVT) message. The issue is that the message refers only to EMS yet is widely used for postal products other than EMS – such as registered letters and parcels.

43      The IB explained that a proposal was made to EXG for a "minimal change" approach such that the name of the message would remain as it currently is (due to its widespread usage with no major reported problems). However, the fact that the message covers products other than EMS would be referenced in a revision to the notes in the standard.

44      The IB clarified that the EXG agreed with this but also suggested that the PEB (Publications Editorial Board) should investigate to make additional editorial changes.

45      Thus, rather than presenting the revised M17, without the changes that may be made by the PEB, to the Standards Board it was decided to wait until the PEB had also completed their work on the editorial changes and then to present the new proposed M17 standard to the next Standards Board for approval. (AP:PEB/EXG)

***g      M33a, M34a, M34b, M36a and M36b – IMPC-defined mail sub-class codes – update proposal***
POC SB 2006.3–Doc 4g

46      In connection with item 4e of this report. IPC presented a proposal to modify code lists 116 and 117 to support the bilaterally agreed use of IMPC-allocated numeric mail class codes and alphanumeric mail subclass code.

47      The following changes were required to support the use of alphanumeric mail subclass values: Do you really need the following detail? Did SB approve the change or not?

–      M33a clause 7.46 (item.mail-class): a1 => an1 (already considered in doc 4e);

–      M33a clause 7.48 (item.mail-sub-class): a2 => an2; (already considered in doc 4e)

–      M34a clause 8.34 (aggregate.sub-class): a2 => an2;

–      M34b (segment 9, PGI data element 5389, used for aggregate.sub-class): delete (a2);

–      M36a clause 8.16 (despatch sub-class): a2 => an2;

–      M36b (segment 8, PGI data element 5389, used for despatch sub-class): delete (a2);

–      M36b (segment 27, PGI data element 5389, used for aggregate.sub-class): delete (a2).

–      S8 update the references to S6, which has been superseded by S34; add explicit references to the code list for mail category and mail subclass and update the format by including required sections.

48      Australia Post sent an email expressing concerns to modification of S8 noticing that rules for using of dispatch serial numbers requires further clarification and specification. In addition, they documented instances whereby administrations have utilised two serial sequences for the same origin/destination IMPC, Mail Category, Mail Subclass and year. Other instances have been observed whereby a "used" serial sequence has been reused within the same calendar year. It is believed that as serial number for despatch is currently documented in S8 it will continue to cause operational, accounting, quality of service and EDI problems affecting postal administrations and customers.

49      Detailed specification where the Mail Category code (a1) shows up as occupying positions 13 to 15 rather than just position 13 was pointed out to be fixed.

50    Considering that updates to a standard with Status 2 should be submitted to POC, IB suggested that those issues raised by Australia Post should be considered all together to update S8 in total.

51    Following discussion, the SB approved the annexed specifications for M34 and M36, for publishing, (AP:IB/PEB) except for S8 that returned to DCG for further review. (AP: DCG). In addition, PEB was asked to forward branching diagrams of M34 and M36 to EXG for recommendation, under PEB control. (AP:PEB/EXG)

**h    *S23 Radio Frequency Identification (RFID) and Radio Data Capture (RDC) Systems – Air interfaces: Communications and interfaces - Part F: Parameter Values for 433 MHz RFID Systems – Status 0 request***
POC SB 2006.3–Doc 4h

52    The UPU has long had a significant role in the development of RFID standards. In particular, the following working draft standards have been developed:

–    S20–3    Identification and marking using Radio Frequency Identification Technology: Reference architecture and terminology

–    S21–2    Data presentation in ASN.1

–    S22–3    Identification and marking using Radio Frequency Identification Technology: System requirements and test procedures

–    S23a–2    Radio Frequency Identification (RFID) and Radio Data Capture (RDC) Systems – Air interfaces: Communications and interfaces Part A: Definitions of parameters to be standardized

–    S23b–1    Radio Frequency Identification (RFID) and Radio Data Capture (RDC) Systems – Air Interfaces: Communications and Interfaces Part B: Parameter Values for 5.8 GHz RFID Systems

–    S23c–1    Radio Frequency Identification (RFID) and Radio Data Capture (RDC) Systems – Air interfaces: Communications and interfaces Part C: Parameter Values for 2.45 GHz Narrow Band RFID Systems

–    S23g–1    Radio Frequency Identification (RFID) and Radio Data Capture (RDC) Systems – Air interfaces: Communications and interfaces Part G: Parameter Values for 13.56 MHz Band RFID Systems.

53    As a result of resourcing issues, little attention has been paid to further RFID standardisation work since the Status 0 approval of the above standards.

54    IPC indicated that it would now be appropriate to continue the work of developing air interface standards, in particular by standardising the interface used by the 433 MHz devices used in the UNEX performance monitoring system.

55    The development of part F of S23, covering the 433 MHz band, is envisaged in S23a. There have been no changes to its intended scope, or to the benefits of its development: namely the formal specification of the air interface for the RFID device which is in most widespread use, within the postal industry, today.

56    The benefit of adoption of the specification is that it provides a formal specification of the air interface of an RFID device which is already extensively used. It is hope that this will permit the standard to be submitted for endorsement by ISO. This will have the benefit of ensuring that any other 433 MHz specifications approved as ISO standards will be required to be at least non-interfering.

57    There is, however, one issue which prevents an immediate application for the allocation of status 1. This concerns the question of IPR. IPC declared to own two patents: principle of wake up with 1 frequency: transmit at another and specific aspects of the tag design and implementation.. decided how it w

58    USPS agreed to the IPC strategy of first designing a UPU standard then approach the ISO for commitment. Regarding IPR disclosed it is the responsibility of the IPR owner to decide how UPU would deal with these issues. They are considered workable consequently would not be a SB concern at this moment.

59    An extensive discussion was taken about conformity of the standard with national requirements. Brazilian Post explained that Brazilian regulators does not prohibit the use of this frequency however it does not protect it. It means that it can be used but complaints will not be accepted if there is interference with other devices that use the same frequency. Having a standard in line with ISO would help to ensure local authorities (that regulate the use of the electromagnetic spectrum) reserve this RFID frequency for postal applications.

60    The SB granted Status 0 to the draft S23 part F attached as Annexe 1 of Doc 4h for publishing (AP: IB/PEB), allocating follow-up of the resolution of IPR issues to the PEG. (AP:PEG)


**V.    Metrics for standards usage – illustrated report**
       POC SB 2006.3–Doc 5

61    There was no document 5. Instead, a presentation was made by IPC about metrics for standards usage. The presentation is attached as annexe 3 of this report.

62    At the last meeting SB agreed that the use of standards would be the measure of success for the SB. IPC brought the example shown at last meeting and extended it to give product type for messages and code usage.

63    The SB chairman suggested including information about the number of administration that are using standards as well as a way to drill down it geographically. Comparing periods from last year to this year would help to identify  trends.

64    The SB endorsed the measures of SB progress and concluded that a report with a layout should be presented for the next meeting. (AP:IPC)


**VI.   Operational and accounting procedure review – discussion on Congress Resolution 33
       – progress report**
       POC SB 2006.2–Doc 7

65    The document was presented and summarised by IB. The 2004 Bucharest Congress adopted Resolution C33, which was titled: Comprehensive review of UPU operational and accounting procedures. In summary, the purpose of the resolution is to review the UPU's operational and accounting procedures, with the aim of increasing the electronic exchange of information, and where possible to replace existing paper procedures with electronic alternatives. The full text of the resolution is attached to this document in Annexe 1. It is clear that this topic bears a close relationship with the Standardisation activities of the UPU, and therefore with the activities of the Standards Board.

66    This issue was last discussed at the occasion of the meeting of the Data and Coding Definition Group (DCG), which took place on the 9th of March 2006 in Brussels, a general discussion was held about the work that is intended to take place. It will be the intention to continue to inform the DCG of the developments, and to involve that group in the discussions. At the DCG it was noted that the Nordic countries are also working to replace parts of the traditional paper documentation with electronic exchanges. It was agreed to ensure a close coordination with the work that is going on within the Nordic countries, and the first contacts to that effect have in

the meantime been established. A plan of activities is aimed for the next POC. The SB was requested to note and support in principle the content of the document and provide any comments it may deem appropriate.

67     The SB endorsed the content of the document and took note of the update.


**VII.    *Copyright and IPR policies – update proposal***
         POC SB 2006.3–Doc 7

68     The USPS presented document 7. This document outlined a draft IPR policy which took into account not only the participants of the working groups, but also "external" parties that participated in standards development. The need for such a document stemmed from copyright issues that arose during the development of UPU Technical Standards S18 and S40. For these standards, it had proved necessary to request certain parties to specifically waive any copyrights they might have on (part of) the written material.

69     A draft policy was proposed at the April SB 2006.2 meeting which was agreed in principle. Members were to review the draft with their IPR counsel and report if it was acceptable. If all members found it acceptable, the policy would be approved at that point in time, with no further action by the SB required.

70     Upon review USPS found it could not accept the policy as drafted. SB members were notified that the draft, as it was, could not proceed. A proposed revision was drafted by USPS and circulated to the ad hoc group for comment.

71     Substantial discussion via email ensued. Timing is such that the revisions to the draft policy are being put forward once again now for review by the ad hoc group and the SB. Because of the high interest in the topic, we are seeking to raise it now to the SB.

72     In pursuance of protecting the interests of the UPU and its members while encouraging an open dialog during the standards process, changes were made in the original document and the SB was requested to review and discuss the revised draft proposal and decide if following a provisional acceptance course is appropriate.

73     The USPS commented that although this draft was discussed and reviewed still remain concerns about from USPS legal advisor. He feels that there is not enough emphasis on duty to comply with this IPR policy. By the other hand, there is a goal to encourage an open dialog among meeting participants. Considering the huge amount of patents held by large organizations, there is no means that an individual be aware of them in order to disclose it. Therefore, the intent is to facilitate the disclosure of patents that participants are aware of during the meetings.

74     TPG Post suggested modifying the text in the second line of the introduction as follows: "This policy applies to the UPU Standards Board and its permanent and ad-hoc working groups". It was believed that it should start being applied initially to the SB environment and steps would be followed to make it a model that might be adopted by other bodies at the IB.

75     Another point raised by TPG was the fact that an individual has a duty to disclose any IPR which is known by that individual. The actual version was around 50% modified from the previous version and still modifications have been proposed.

76     The USPS explained that there is a need to cover both participant roles as an individual or representative of an organization. For instance, what individuals perform is tied back by contract to their organization.

77     A repetition of substantial changes to this document proposed after deadlines and close to meeting dates was raised by the IB as having great impact on the conclusion of this issue. Confirming that there was no consensus in the group to approve the update proposal, the SB requested to revise the actual version and elaborate a new simple version (synthesised in a

paragraph) both to be commented by the ad-hoc group and SB members and presented to the 2006.4 SB meeting. (AP:US/IPC/CEN Siemens/TPG/IB) All comments shall be sent to IB Secretariat by 21 July 2006. (IB/All)

## VIII.   Unified barcode ID – proposed work item
POC SB 2006.2–Doc 10

78    In Doc 10 the USPS proposes the use of an "integrated" barcode to encode unique identifiers, service/product identifiers and routing information within a single barcode for cross border parcel and packages. The resultant outcome of the use of a unified barcode ID in USPS domestic network has been an improved automation compatibility of parcels, improved accuracy in recognition and capture of barcode information during processing and delivery operations – all this resulting in improved service performance. The SB was requested to grant Status P to this subject or incorporate it in existing working items or potential solutions.

79    IPC agreed with the principles of an integrated barcode, however pointed out that there is no need for a new work item or standard. In fact some standards can cover this need: S25 defines an appropriate data construct, S49 defines how it can be used for customer encoding and S46 defines representation using Code 128 (and other symbologies). More details are covered in Annexe 2 of this report.

80    The presentation was finalised with a conclusion that CBC Working Group, reporting to the PEG should review with USPS as follows:

–    There is no need for a new work item or new standard

–    Evaluate USPS requirements

–    Develop any necessary improvement proposals

–    Deal with S26 issues (this currently requires parcel license plates to be encoded as a licence plate (with data identifier J) in Code 128, even if (also) encoded in some other form.

81    The results can be adopted by other countries as well.

82    The SB adopted IPC's recommendation. (AP:CBC WG/PEG).

## IX.   Moving from paper to electronic documents – Status of USPS
POC SB 2006.2–Doc 11

83    Document 11 synthesized a discussion by USPS of goal and action taken to facilitate using electronic documents as the preferred method of exchanging information between partners. The Standards Board was requested to acknowledge the direction being taken by USPS and discuss the merits and any further action. This concept has been worked out with some airlines exchanging electronic communication instead of paper documents.

84    Following discussions, SB took note of the document.

## X.   RFID Forum programme – proposal
POC SB 2006.3–Doc 10

85    Document 10 was generated after a request from the SB (2006.2 meeting) to organise a Forum on RFID Technology to understand and discuss developments and applications to the postal industry and present a conference programme. The issue was broadly discussed at the 2006.2 PEG meeting. It was agreed that USPS, along with IPC, will take the lead on this event and a programme was drafted.

86    USPS noted that Ross Hinds from IPC kindly consented to be the forum moderator. USPS further explained that some people suggested in the document have not been contacted yet. The space is still open for other ideas and participation.

87    IPC said that RFID is not the only technology. There are some technologies being used for some countries, GPS is an example. It was suggested to widen the investigation of using other technologies and find out which one would be more appropriate to the postal services. For instance, under the UNEX test letter, RFID proved to be 95% reliable. Additional comments to input in the draft.

88    Brazilian Post is making some experiments using RFID for a type of domestic aggregated mail service that consists of a direct bag service between two points with a contracted despatch-frequency (Serviço de Correspondência Agrupada). All these bags have a bar code tag and can be transporting aggregate mail and/or goods. The idea is to replace those bar codes tags by RFID tags for this specific service. A presentation can be given by Brazilian Post showing the results of this experiment.

89    TPG Post volunteered a speaker in RFID. Solystic would provide a presentation on fingerprints usage and the representative of IPC Ross Hinds would provide a presentation on GPS.

90    The SB endorsed the draft presented and acknowledged the feedback from the group regarding the extension to other technologies and the voluntary contribution to the Forum. A date of 6 December 2006 in Berne was proposed and accepted to hold this Forum.

91    The SB also established 31 July 2006 as the deadline for liaise with volunteer participants and other speakers, conclude the final agenda (AP:USPS/IPC) and confirm the venue (AP:IB). An update report will be prepared for the 2006.4 SB meeting. (AP:USPS) The Forum title was confirmed as "RFID and related technologies".


**XI.    Requirement for 2d symbols to comply with ISO/IEC 15434 and S28 – EICTA letter and response**
      POC SB 2006.3–Doc 11

92    The topic of 2d symbol compliance with ISO/IEC 15434 and UPU standard S28 has been considered in several past PEG and SB meetings, notably in PEG meetings 2004-3 and 2004-4 and in SB meeting 2004-4. Pursuant to the above referenced meetings, contact was made with the main suppliers of franking machines with a view to soliciting their support in encouraging compliance in future product offerings. This matter has led to a presentation being given to the EICTA Mailtec group in April 2005. Consequently EICTA addressed a letter to the IB, in which they raised a number of issues. A draft response was reviewed by the 2006.2 PEG meeting.

93    During its 2006.2 meeting, the SB requested a teleconference involving IPC, the IB and the USPS to resolve any pending issues, finalise the answer and send the letter. The result, after minor amendments proposed by IPC, is attached to this document.

94    The SB was requested to review the draft response, amend it as required and request that it be sent to EICTA by IB.

95    The SB agreed to proceed and sent the letter proposed in Annexe 1 of this document. (AP:IB)

## XII.  Publication of revised reports

96    The IB made a presentation on providing a mechanism to be dealing with the publication of revised reports. The screenshots of IB document database were shown to better envisage the proposed procedure.

97    The IB reminded that the business issue is that there is no mechanism to make amendments to meeting reports once they are published. A case in point is EXG 2005.4 wherein there was an error in the published meeting report – referring to the wrong version of a message standard. In the current state there is no mechanism to correct an error such as this in a report.

98    The IB indicated that currently the practise is to publish the report of a meeting as an item (always document 2) in the next meeting. Thus each meeting has a document 2, "report of the last meeting". Currently there is no concept of draft report versus final report.

99    The IB proposal, to apply to the Standards Board and all working groups, is as follows:

–    To continue with the concept of "report of the last meeting", but this report would be clearly identified as a draft report. The agenda topic would be "draft report of the last meeting".

–    To introduce a new category to the IB structure of standards publications on the web. This would be titled "meeting reports" and would contain the final version of meeting reports. This category would appear immediately after the name (i. e Standards Board, PEG, EXG, DCG, CDIG, IATA/UPU Group on EDI).

100   After discussion, the Standards Board endorsed this proposal to be implemented by the IB. (AP:IB)

## XIII.  Any other business

*a    Survey of Standards Board activities.*

101   The USPS proposed a questionnaire to investigate the effectiveness of messaging and technical standards before the postal community as well as how the Standards Board activities are being perceived. The target will be 2007.

102   The SB suggested that a document be drafted to be discussed at the next SB meeting. (AP:USPS)

*b    Other meetings*

103   Next IATA–UPU on EDI Issues and CDIG were set on 11 and 12 October 2006, respectively, in Berne.

## XIV.  Date and place of the next meetings

104  The schedule of future meetings was confirmed as follows:

–   SB 2006.4        Berne, 09 October 2006

–   SB 2007.1        Rio de Janeiro or Salvador, 13 to 15 February 2007

–   SB 2007.2        Berne,  April 2007

–   SB 2007.3        London, July 2007

–   SB 2007.4        Berne, October 2007

–   SB 20081         Orlando, January/February 2008


Charles E. Bravo

Chairman of the Standards Board


Annexe:
1     List of participants
2     IPC's presentation on Unified barcode ID
3     IPC's presentation on Metrics for standards usage

**Action point list**

| Number (paragraph) | Action | Responsible body |
|---|---|---|
| 1 (4) | Submit S40-4 to ANSI & SC31 and CEN | IPC |
| 2 (4) | Investigate the possibility of an Union Postale article on M38, International Money Orders | IB |
| 3 (4) | Work out more details about the issues raised by La Poste (use of F1 area) | ID-tag WG |
| 4 (4) | Provide the 2006.3 SB meeting with a progress report on Mandatory standards – references, availability and translations | IB |
| 5 (4) | Collaborative work between PEB and the working group should be done to work out the proposed editorial changes to finalise S43 | PEB/EPS Group |
| 6 (4) | Publish S43 - Editorial changes must be made changing "Electronic PostMark" to "electronic postmark" in the entire document, except for HTML files or the beginning of sentences (that would be Electronic postmark) and deleting the postmark image example on page 25 | PEB/IB |
| 7 (4) | Document a proposal to modify the Standards Approval Process so that it will be possible to withdraw status 2 standards without necessarily needing to get this endorsed by the POC plenary. This proposal should be presented to the 2006.3 SB meeting | IB |
| 8 (4) | Draft a paper an evaluation of actions that should be taken to increase the level of cooperation. This will involve other UPU bodies as well as different organisational units within the UPU/IB | IB |
| 9 (4) | Conduct a survey of existing IMPCs to be carried out by IB in the second semester of 2006, asking them to provide the necessary data to populate the additional column in code list 108 | IB |
| 10 (21) | Review S18 ID-tagging of letter mail item Part D regarding to objection raised by La Poste, FR, on address being overlapped by labels | ID-tag WG |
| 11 (22) | Publish update to S18 Parts B and E (presented in Doc 4a) | IB/PEB |
| 12 (28) | Provide another country to commit the tests on P27 before requesting SB to grant Status O | ID-tag WG |
| 13 (32) | Publish update to the UPU standards glossary (presented in Doc 4c) adjusting NOTE on Code 39 according to La Poste remarks | IB/PEB |
| 14 (35) | Publish updates to S19 Parts A, B and C (presented in Doc 4d) | IB/PEB |
| 15 (35) | Update S19d for the 2006.4 SB meeting | PEG |
| 16 (41) | Publish updates to M30b, M31, M32a; M32b, M33a M33b and M33c (presented in Doc 4e) | IB/PEB |
| 17 (45) | Review M17 taking in account potential further changes referred to EXG and submit its update to 2006.4 SB meeting | PEB/EXG |

| Number (paragraph) | Action | Responsible body |
|---|---|---|
| 18 (51) | Publish updates to M34a, M34b, M36a and M36b (presented in Doc 4g) | IB/PEB |
| 19 (51) | Review S8 taking in account Australia Post concerns and submit to the 2006.4 SB meeting | DCG |
| 20 (51) | Forward branching diagrams of M34 and M36 to EXG for recommendation, under PEB control. | PEB/EXG |
| 21 (60) | Publish update to S23 part F (presented in Doc 4h) | IB/PEB |
| 22 (60) | Follow-up resolution of IPR issues to the PEG related to S23 | PEG |
| 23 (64) | Present a report on Metrics for standards usage (with layout) to the 2006.4 SB meeting | IPC |
| 24 (77) | Revise the actual version of Copyright and IPR policies (presented in Doc 7) and elaborate a new simple version (synthesised in a paragraph) both to be commented by the ad-hoc group and SB members and presented to the 2006.4 SB meeting | US/IPC/CEN Siemens/TPG/IB |
| 25 (77) | Send comments on IPR Copyright and IPR policies (presented in Doc 7) to SB secretariat on 21 July 2006 at latest, to be forwarded to the ad-hoc working group | IB/All |
| 26 (82) | Review with USPS the requirements and develop a proposal for using a unified barcode (to be applied to other countries if required) | CBC WG/PEG |
| 27 (91) | Liaise with volunteer participants and other speakers and, conclude the final agenda of the Forum "RFID and related technologies". Deadline: 31 July 2006 | USPS/IPC |
| 28 (91) | Confirm the venue (related to action point 26). Deadline: 31 July 2006 | IB |
| 29 (91) | Prepare an update report to the 2006.4 SB meeting (related to action point 26) | USPS |
| 30 (95) | Sent the letter proposed in Annexe 1 of Doc 11 to EICTA | IB |
| 31 (100) | Adjust UPU web page layout to encompass the process of publication of revised reports and implement the process | IB |
| 32 (102) | Draft a proposal addressing the survey of SB activities to be presented at the 2006.4 SB meeting | USPS |

UNIVERSAL POSTAL UNION

POSTAL OPERATIONS COUNCIL

**STANDARDS BOARD**

Paris, 11 July 2006 (09:00 – 18:00)

## List of attendees

| Organization | Name of participant | e-mail address |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Brazilian Post | Marcelo Macedo de Castro | marcelomc@correios.com.br |
| 2. Canada Post | Stephanie Glover | stephanie.glover@canadapost.ca |
| 3. CEN/Solystic | François Gillet | francois.gillet@solystic.com |
| 4. IPC | John Wells | john.wells@ipc.be |
| 5. IPC | Ross Hinds | ross.hinds@ipc.be |
| 6. Japan Post | Kazuo Kamishiro | k-kamish@japanpost.jp |
| 7. La Poste –FR | Bernard Rouille | bernard.rouille@laposte.fr |
| 8. La Poste – FR | Vincent Ortega | vincent.ortega@laposte.fr |
| 9. Polish Post | Michal Wegrzynowicz | michal.wegrzynowicz@centrala.poczta-polska.pl |
| 10. Royal Mail | Nick Glynn | nick.glynn@royalmail.com |
| 11. Sweden Post | Lars-erik Torstenson | lars-erik.torstenson@posten.se |
| 12. TPG Post | Benno Enthoven | b.g.enthoven@tpgpost.nl |
| 13. TPG Post | Dick Brandt | d.brandt@tpgpost.nl |
| 14. TPG Post | Frank Nauta | f.a.nauta@tpgpost.nl |
| 15. USPS | Charles Bravo **(Chairman)** | charles.e.bravo@usps.gov |
| 16. USPS | Clayton Bonnell | cbonnell@email.usps.gov |
| 17. UPU/IB | Alex Gomes da Silva | alex.gomesdasilva@upu.int |
| 18. UPU/IB | Jelto Stant | jelto.stant@upu.int |

## List of apologies received

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Australia Post | Chris Grosser | chris.grosser@auspost.com.au |
| 2. Australia Post | Sam Curro | sam.curro@auspost.com.au |
| 3. CTT Portugal | Pedro Furtado Pereira | Pedro.F.Pereira@CTT.pt |
| 4. Finland Post | Urpo Siitonen | urpo.siitonen@posti.fi |
| 5. Post Danmark | Christian Göttsche | christian.goettsche@post.dk |
| 6. SIEMENS | Juergen Schad | Juergen.Schad@siemens.com |

DOT.PN
GdS
11.07.2006

International **Post**
Corporation

# 8 Unified barcode ID

- **Absolutely agree with the principles…**

- **…but there is NO need for a new work item or standard…**

- **The requested standard(s) ALREADY exist…**
  - S25 defines an appropriate data construct
  - S49 defines how it can be used for customer encoding
  - S46 defines representation using Code 128 (and other symbologies)

**Let's look at what already exists**

---

International **Post**
Corporation

# 8 Unified barcode ID (2)

- **S25: Licence plate with service data and location code**
  - **Licence plate (LP)**
  - **Service data (SD)**
  - **Location (or routing) code (RC)**

- **General form: (19U) LP+SD+RC**
  - **Encoded as a single construct**
  - **S49 allows encoding as OCR, as Code 128, Data Matrix or PDF417**

- **Example (using C128 with X = 0,33; 15 mm height)**
  - **JD00 005 900 5 82 1478424 (a real LP issued by DHL Express)**
  - **1C304052 (parcel, B2B, COD, Insured)**
  - **AU.VIC (Victoria State, Australia)**
    **(19U)JD00005900582147 8424+1C304052+AU.VIC**

1 9 U J D 0 0 0 0 5 9 0 0 5 8 2 1 4 7 8 4 2 4 + 1 C 3 0 4 0 5 2 + A U . V I C

## 8     Unified barcode ID (2)

- **Specific form:**
  - LP has to be J5Eiiinnnnnnnnnnnnn (S31 issuer code + 13 digits)
    OR J5Fiiimmssnnnnnnnnnc (<u>derived</u> from a 13 character item ID)
  - SD has to be 5nnn (000-799 locally defined; 800-999 UPU defined)
  - RC has to be CC or CC-postcode_or_extended_postcode

- **IF specific form conditions fulfilled:**
  - LP prefix (J5E or J5F) can be omitted
  - SD defining authority (5) can be omitted
  - RC separator(s) (- and space) can be omitted
  - + separators can be omitted
  - Postal-4i encoding can be used as well as other symbologies

## 8     Unified barcode ID (3)

- **Example:**
  - LP:     J5FU2855CP473124829 (corresponds to CP473124829US)
  - SD:     5123 (USPS defined service code 123)
  - RC:     US-22082-8101

- **Can be represented as:**
  - (19U) J5FU2855CP473124829+5123+US-22082-8101
    (149 mm at X = 0,33 mm)
  
  OR as
  
  `1 9 U J 5 F U 2 8 5 5 C P 4 7 3 1 2 4 8 2 9 + 5 1 2 3 + U S - 2 2 0 8 2 - 8 1 0 1`
  
  - (19U) U2855CP473124829123US220828101
    (106 mm at X =0,33 mm)
  
  `1 9 U U 2 8 5 5 C P 4 7 3 1 2 4 8 2 9 1 2 3 U S 2 2 0 8 2 8 1 0 1`

# 8 Unified barcode ID (4)

- **Conclusion**
  - No need for a new work item
  - No need for a new standard
  - CBC WG, reporting to the PEG, should review with USPS
    - Evaluate USPS requirements
    - Develop any necessary improvement proposals
      (e.g. Code 128 could be reduced by 11 mm if data re-ordered)
    - Deal with S26 issue: this currently requires parcel licence plates to be encoded as a licence plate (with data identifier J) in Code 128, even if (also) encoded in some other form
  - USPS (and others) should adopt the result

POC SB 2006.3 - Doc 5

Ross Hinds
UPU Standards Board
Paris
11 July 2006

International **Post**
Corporation

# Metrics for
# Standards Use

International **Post**
Corporation

# Metrics for Standards Usage

- Agreed that the use of standards would be the measure of success for SB
- Example shown at last meeting
- Extended to give product type for messages
- Code usage

**Message standard use by product**
(from IPC databases for June 2006)

| Messages ,000 | Letters | | Parcels | | EMS | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PREDES V1 | 8* | 6% | 0 | 1% | 0 | 0% |
| PREDES V2 | 124º | 94% | 43 | 99% | 80 | 100% |
| PREDES V3 | | | 0 | 0% | | |
| | | | | | | |
| **Admins** | | | | | | |
| PREDES V1 | 13 | 24% | 11 | 22% | 7 | 12% |
| PREDES V2 | 47 | 87% | 42 | 82% | 44 | 75% |
| PREDES V3 | | | 2 | 4% | | |
| | 2005 13* | | 2005 108º | | | |



**Message standard use by product**
(from IPC databases for June 2006)

| Messages ,000 | Letters | | Parcels | | EMS | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| EMSEVT V0 | | | | | 39 | 10% |
| EMSEVT V1 | 48 | 100% | 233 | 100% | 355 | 90% |
| | | | | | | |
| **Admins** | | | | | | |
| EMSEVT V0 | | | | | 78 | 70% |
| EMSEVT V1 | 24 | 100% | 51 | 100% | 108 | 96% |

## Standard Code usage
**(from IPC databases for June 2006)**

International **Post**
Corporation

### IMPC Codes

| | |
|---|---|
| Total in list | 2,051 |
| Active codes | 1,610 |
| PREDES/RESDES | 581 |

### Party Identifiers

| | |
|---|---|
| Total in list | 216 |
| Active | 68 |

---

## Standard Code usage
**(from IPC databases for June 2006)**

International **Post**
Corporation

### Mail Class & Subclass

| Code | Despatches | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| UN | 84,452 | 33% | Letters LC/AO |
| EM | 47,606 | 18% | EMS merchandise |
| CN | 30455 | 12% | Parcels ordinary |
| UL | 23,415 | 9% | LC |
| ED | 21,891 | 8% | EMS documents |
| CE | 10,426 | 4% | EPG |
| EN | 10,890 | 4% | EMS mixed |

**Standard Code usage**
(from IPC databases for June 2006)

**Format of contents**

| None | 168,669 | 46% |
|---|---|---|
| E | 56,110 | 15% |
| G | 51,250 | 14% |
| P | 46,307 | 13% |
| X | 41,776 | 11% |



**Standard Code usage**
(from IPC databases for June 2006)

**Receptacle type**

| BG | 282,913 | 77% |
|---|---|---|
| IL | 39,217 | 11% |
| CN | 13,258 | 4% |
| PU | 13,986 | 4% |
| GU | 9,883 | 3% |

**Standard Code usage**
(from IPC databases for June 2006)

**Receptacle event**

| Code | Receptacles | | |
|------|-------------|------|-------------------|
| 20 | 2,262,392 | 99% | ok |
| 21 | 8,946 | 0% | Weather damage |
| 39 | 1,586 | 0% | |
| 25 | 763 | 0% | Unreadable barcode |

International **Post** Corporation



**Standard Code usage**
(from IPC databases for June 2006)

**Mail Category**

| Code | Despatches | | |
|------|------------|------|---------------------------|
| A | 217,986 | 84% | Air mail (Priority) |
| B | 15,558 | 6% | SAL mail |
| C | 14,736 | 6% | Surface Mail |
| D | 10,723 | 4% | Priority Mail by surface |

International **Post** Corporation

## Standard Code usage
**(from IPC databases for June 2006)**

### Handling Class

| Code | Receptacles | | |
|------|------------|------|------|
| N | 1,612,051 | 62% | Normal |
| None | 798,494 | 31% | |
| R | 171,103 | 7% | Registered |
| V | 22,803 | 1% | Insured |
| A | 39 | 0% | Recorded delivery |

## Standard Code usage
**(from IPC databases for June 2006)**

### Transport Mode

| Code | Receptacles | | |
|------|------------|------|------|
| 4 | 338,753 | 89% | Air |
| 3 | 35,676 | 9% | Road |
| 1 | 1,115 | 0% | Sea |
| 2 | 74 | 0% | Rail |