



STANDARDS BOARD

DATA AND CODE DEFINITION GROUP (DCG) 2006.2

Konstanz , 9 June 2006

Report

- 1 The 2006.2 DCG meeting was held in Konstanz on 9 June 2006. The list of participants is provided in Annex 1. The main conclusions of the meeting are listed below. An action point list is added as annex 2, showing all the points on which action by a particular party is expected.

I. Opening of meeting and adoption of agenda

POC SB DCG 2006.2 Doc 1 rev 2

- 2 The agenda was adopted, but the order of the agenda was changed to facilitate timing. The following items were added under "any other business" and are in section XVII:

Code list 121 receptacle-type
Code list 120 format-of-contents
Code list 115 mail category.

II. Report of last meeting

POC SB DCG 2006.1 Report

- 3 The IB presented the report of the last meeting. All action points were either completed or will be on the 2006.3 agenda or otherwise appear in the revised action point list - included as annex 2. Those issues that were discussed follow. Note that the reference at the beginning is the original meeting number and paragraph. The discussion is in *italics*

i) 2005.3.13 Correct errors in M84 highlighted by IPC

The IB had requested clarification from IPC and is awaiting this clarification. This continues to be a DCG action point.

ii) 2006.1.13 Investigate with New Zealand the possibility of using a UNLocode other than GBLAL for their new ETOE IMPCs .

The IB advised that GB assisted with this and was successful. The IB thanked GB for their intervention. This was deleted as a DCG action point

iii) 2006.1.20 Put P6 (Classification of Mail) on 2006.2 Agenda.

The IB explained that this was not put on the agenda as it was unclear what the purpose of having it on the agenda was, or who the sponsor of the agenda topic would be. In discussion, it possibly was to cause P6 to be withdrawn. This was deleted as a DCG action point.

III. Standards Board 2006.2 report

POC SB 2006.2 Report

- 4 The IB presented the report- which is available on the website. The chairman especially noted paragraphs 73-75 titled *Cooperation with ISO*, showing the positive results of the of the recently held first meeting between the Director General of the UPU and the Secretary General of ISO.
- 5 The IB noted the importance of section *IX - Metrics for standards usage*, a presentation by IPC. The presentation is related to using existing databases to provide information on the degree of usage or compliance to standards. The presentation by the IPC to the Standards Board, as an example of the data available, is included as annex 4. The IB noted that this presents considerable opportunity to help to manage standards developments and suggested that the working group members to bring forward any suggestions that they may have.
- 6 The next meeting of the Standards Board will take place in Paris 11 July 2006.

IV. IATA/UPU Group on EDI Issues report
POC SB IATA/UPU 2006.1 Report

- 7 The chairman gave a briefing of the meeting that was held on 30 March and explained that there is a planned sub-group meeting at IATA in September to address some of the issues raised and that other issues are covered in the meeting agenda.

V. Customs Data Interchange Group report

- 8 There was no CDIG meeting, thus there was no discussion on this agenda topic. The CDIG meeting originally scheduled for 31 March 2006 was postponed so as to follow the Standards Board 2006.3 meeting, in July.

VI. CAM Group report
POC SB DCG 2006.2 Doc 6

- 9 The Code Allocation and Maintenance (CAM) Group report consists of a summary of the Group's code allocations and decisions since the last DCG meeting. In the case of IMPCs, the IB explained that this report also lists the changes to IMPC attributes and that thus this report includes more than CAM activities.
- 10 On the list Requests for S31 or S35 Issuer codes, IPC(JW) raised an issue of code J1CFRC wherein IPC had been using an unassigned code in the Customer Service (Rugby) system. IPC(JW) requested the IB to take this up with the IPC as an urgent issue.

The IB noted that it was not considered urgent at the time as there were no business issues impacted and the case in question had been taken up with IPC.

IPC(MH) also explained that IPC have internal systems that do not use the UPU code list as the prime identifier. The IPC systems must be able to process all incoming data, even when it contains references to codes that have not been included in the UPU code list yet. In that case there is no option but attribute a code internal to the systems. In that regards the code FRC should be considered as a pure internal IPC code used in RUGBY.

After discussion, it was agreed that IB will refer this to IPC with the request that IPC take action on code J1CFRC and any other such codes that may exist in IPC systems. (AP: IB).

- 11 On the issue of new code lists, and following the presentation on MEDICI the prior day at EXG, IPC had made the request for list 179 and 183 to be established and EXG had

agreed. This is now an action item on the EXG report. Note that 179 is Contact method codes and 183 is Customs procedure code list.

- 12 On the IMPC code list, the IB noted that at least one UPU member is now loading the revised IMPC change report directly to their system. This has significant implications on the need for accuracy and is relevant to item *VIII. – IMPC code maintenance*.
- 13 Also on IMPC code lists, IPC(JW) opined that there is “extraordinary reluctance” on the part of the IB to challenge postal administration on the establishment of new IMPCs, especially citing a case with Hong Kong. The IB outlined that IPC(JW) does not see the cases where the IB has taken this issue up with postal administrations and does not agree with this assessment. The IB will provide a report of example cases to the DCG chairman (AP:IB).
- 14 On this issue, PT explained that it is often the case that separate IMPC codes are needed to manage the accounting aspect of the business.

VII. IMPC codes – request by USPS (IB)

POC SB DCG 2006.2 Doc 7

- 15 CAM had referred the USPS request for 3 additional IMPC codes (that result in having more than 6 IMPCs in the same location) to DCG. The reasons were explained and DCG agreed. USPS will be informed by the IB and the IMPC list updated. The IB will also remind USPS that a specific qualifier component of any code cannot always be allocated as requested so it is important to ensure any other codes that may be in use are registered.(AP:IB)

VIII. IMPC code maintenance process (IB)

POC SB DCG 2006.2 Doc 8

- 16 This agenda topic covered four points related to maintenance of IMPC codes. The first point involved minor improvements to the IMPC registration update request form. The improvements were to make the form easier to complete, more legible after being faxed and to include the email address of the initiator of the form.

DCG endorsed the business value of these changes and asked the IB to present a potential revised form (AP:IB).

- 17 The second point was to inform DCG of some structural issues with the current process.

i)that the current process does not accommodate import attributes being different from outbound attributes.

ii) when a minor attribute change is made (example – mail class), the IMPC appears on the List of Closed IMPCs – even though it has not been actually closed.

iii) there are a lot of transcriptions involved in the current system – each increasing the probability of error. The IB pointed out that, now that postal administrations are loading changes directly to their systems, this is increasingly problematic.

The DCG noted the points and asked the IB to investigate any solutions to the first two points. (AP:IB).

PT made the observation that, based on their understanding, IMPC attributes other than 12 and 35 character names and operator code are optional information. The IB noted that this was definitely not the IB interpretation and illustrates a need for clarification in any future system or process.

- 18 The third issue related to the issue raised at the IATA/UPU Group on EDI Issues where IATA suggested that the list should include the contact name and the address.

The IB explained that, with the current process, it would not be possible to maintain the additional information at current resource levels. Contact names, as example, are a very dynamic data element to accurately maintain.

PT also raised the issue of privacy of information as regards contact information. The DCG agreed that this was an important factor to consider.

- 19 The fourth issue put forward by the IB was the concept of a revised system.

Such a system could have considerably more business functionality than the current system

a) It would be web-based such that the majority of the data would be maintained by the IMPC operator.

b) Changes to IMPC registrations would be automatically reported to users and the maintenance authority of the code list.

c) Import attributes could be different from export attributes

d) The timing of web updates would be immediate - not monthly.

e) Based on PREDES data, the system could report inconsistencies between IMPC registrations and actual mail exchanges.

f) With a locally maintained system, the data concerning an IMPC would be expanded considerably. As some examples of potential additional information:

- i) EMS contact information
- ii) Records Section contact Information
- iii) Customs contact information
- iv) Airline contact information
- v) Hours of operation
- vi) PREDES enabled (for import and for export)?
- vii) airport(s) of offload for airmail

It could possibly replace and enhance some of the IMPC-level information currently maintained manually via UPU Letter Post and Parcel Post Compendia of Information as well as similar information in the EMS Operational Guide. It could potentially become a very useful tool for inter-IMPC communication.

- 20 The IB emphasized that this is at the conceptual stage only. To develop such a system would require a solid business case with benefits clearly outlined.

After discussion, DCG members agreed in principle with the concept and were requested to review the issue further and provide comments in more detail. The comments are requested to be on the business requirements and benefits, rather than the technical solution. (AP:All)

- 21 The IB also mentioned that, notwithstanding the issues mentioned above, that the UPU currently has a working system, and a great deal of practical experience is now behind us. We have a lot of "customers" around the world, and many indirect stakeholders. The IB suggests to commend Ms Liz Phelan for bringing the UPU to this current state. The DCG members wholeheartedly agreed.

IX. Publication of UPU code lists as XML – Progress report

- 22 GB provided a presentation on background progress to date. This is in annex 5.
- 23 It was noted that activities to date had focused on having output data in the XML format so that technical users could more easily import the data. There has, as yet, been no analysis of the business processes and technical tools that are used to actually create the data in the first place. The DCG agreed that this is an important aspect.
- 24 It was suggested that GB visit the IB to review these processes (AP:GB). It was also suggested that the PTC be contacted to determine the level of assistance that they may be able to provide in this regard.(AP:IB)

X. IMPC defined mail subclass codes (IPC)

POC SB DCG 2006.2 Doc 10

- 25 This was a follow up to DCG 2006.1 item VII. IPC presented the proposed changes to the standards and the code lists. DCG agreed that these could be presented to the Standards Board 2006.3 (AP:IPC) and that the code lists could be updated (AP:IB).

XI. Usage of "V" on insured parcels – Update by USPS (USPS)

POC SB DCG 2006.2 Doc 11

- 26 This was an information item to bring to UPU circular 172 to the attention of the DCG and to suggest that, based on this circular, the DCG can consider this issue closed The DCG agreed. No specific action is required.

XII. Survey of IMPCs to support *Aggregate Mailstream Segregation Codes* (IB)

POC SB DCG 2006.2 Doc 12

- 27 The IB presented a paper on the IB's perspective of Aggregate Mailstream Segregation Codes as the IB is required to survey all operators/IMPCs as to their position on these codes.

The IB has consulted PTC and considers this to be a very complex business and technical issue. To conduct the survey and deal with the 219 operators and 1616 IMPCs involved the IB requires an understanding of the issues involved and is requesting the support of the DCG members. The IB presented the current IB understanding as per document 12 and asked DCG members to please explain their business plans for this issue.

SE had already provided comments as follows:

" The basic problem with the current code list is that it is ambiguous in some cases, i.e. a fixed set of parameters for a given receptacle can result in several possible segregation codes. There are also some obvious codes missing, i.e. "not final, format specified, receptacle type any". To make it operational you must define some restrictions on which codes to use (what purpose) and redefine some codes. This also calls for bi- or multilateral agreements with other operators to make the same restrictions and redefinitions, for instance to use the code only to indicate format separation and M-bags.

Segregation codes has been discussed a number of times in the REIMS OTG. My belief is that it is only when a user group such as REIMS or the Nordic countries agree to start using mail segregation we can get a clear business case and defined use. When this idea first came up three years ago we saw (and still see) a business case in the flow between Sweden and Finland to segregate between machine- and non machine sortable mail but our intentions has all the time been to use codes in the 80-89 range."

- 28 It was agreed that the IB will update the document with comments received and will re-issue it to the DCG members. (AP:IB). The DCG members agreed to provide their comments within 3 weeks (AP:All).

XIII. IATA codes in CARDIT PREDES PRECON (IB)

POC SB DCG 2006.2 Doc 13

- 29 This issue was originally discussed in DCG 2006.1 and again in IATA/UPU group on EDI issues 2006.1.

The proposal is to change the standards to strongly recommend that IATA airport code be used (rather than IATA city codes) but not to make it mandatory. The reasons for this are:

- Making this mandatory may have significant impact on some postal administrations
- Currently there is no suitable mechanism for UPU to provide a list that identifies IATA airport codes separately from city codes
- Strongly recommending the use of airport codes in the standard encourages these codes to be used.

The DCG agreed in general with the proposal but IPC (JW) suggested some revised wording to handle cases of transport mode being air but the actual transport location being other than an airport. The IB will further develop the revised wording and submit to the chairman and IPC. Note: this action was completed on 12 June 2006 and a revised wording, adding the phrase “*If the location is an airport*”. Thus the wording is as follows::

If mode of transport is “air”, then IATA codes must be used. If the location is an airport, then the IATA airport code rather than the city code should be used. Note that IATA codes do not include the ISO country codes. IATA codes are unique world-wide.

- 30 DCG agreed that this approach will be reviewed with IATA. If IATA agrees, then the issue can be brought to the Standards Board. The next action is to refer it to IATA.(AP:GB/IB).

XIV. Data flow to support postal transit (IB)

POC SB DCG 2006.2 Doc 14

- 31 IB presented the concept of a new data flow for postal closed transit. With this new data flow, origins would receive electronic advice of their receptacles being forwarded onward by transit administrations as closed transit. The IB noted that the issue is a new *data flow* versus the message that may support such a data flow. Only if the data flow warrants establishment should work begin on the solution (i.e. the message).
- 32 Such a data flow would impact postal administrations. It could also impact IPC. The potential benefits and business factors, as per the document, were discussed. They include improved transit operations, improved handling of inquiries, and, in future, improved accounting settlement system.
- 33 It was also noted that, in the event of the POC 2006 proposal to have CN08 Inquiry forms sent to the transit administration being adopted at POC 2007, this new data flow can result in reduced cost in processing enquiries and faster answers to the Customers, amongst participating administrations.
- 34 DCG members agreed to review this issue and provide comment on the business aspects for discussion at DCG 2006.3. (AP:All).

XV. Update of the Standards Glossary (IPC)

POC SB DCG 2006.2 Doc 15

- 35 IPC presented a proposed update to the Standards Glossary. This is in part in support of changes that had been agreed in PEG 2006.2. The substantive change is to define a flat and a small letter as follows:

3.169 small letter: flexible letter-mail item which satisfies UPU Letter Post Manual [1] article RL 128 size and weight limitations for standardized items or is otherwise small and thin enough to be automatically processed on the small letter sorters used by the delivery post

3.68 flat: letter-post item which is too large, too thick or too stiff to qualify as a small letter, but which has a size of 229 mm by 334 mm or less; a maximum thickness of 20 mm and a maximum weight of 500 g or can otherwise be automatically processed on the flat sorters used by the delivery post

- 36 In discussion it was noted (previously at PEG the prior day) that, with this definition, an item being defined at origin as a small letter or as a flat depends, to a degree, on the delivery address of the item. It was also noted (previously at PEG the prior day) discussion concerning the aspect of “flexibility” - as to whether flexibility should be an element in the definition.
- 37 The DCG approved the proposed update of the glossary, with an adjustment to handle the aspect of flexibility, for submission to SB 2006.3 (AP:IPC).

XVI. Questionnaire on the use of Event E and Event F and associated codes – progress report (IB)

POC SB DCG 2006.2 Doc 16 rev 1

- 38 The IB reported the following since DCG 2006.1, based on doc 16 rev 1:
- i) The IB had developed the questionnaire and in so doing had consulted with EMS Task Force in IPC, the EPG program manager and the EMS Unit at the IB.
 - ii) Three of the DCG members had completed the questionnaire as had been requested. These were Sweden, Portugal and Great Britain. In addition, IPC(JW) had provided comments suggesting changes to the questionnaire and USPS had also provided comments.
 - iii) At the DCG, those who had completed the questionnaire indicated that that they had no problems doing so (this type of feedback was one of the important objectives of the initial exercise). The IB noted that of the 3 questionnaires that were completed, the actual business use of the item-customs retention codes by origins was quite minimal.
 - iv) The IB advised that they had done an initial review of the comments from IPC(JW), and that they clearly constitute significant change to the structure of the questionnaire. Development of questionnaires that are comprehensible to the person completing the questionnaire, and not overly time-consuming, can be complex. And in this case, the subject matter itself is somewhat complex.
 - v) The IB explained that they were not in position to meet the objective of developing a questionnaire that is comprehensive and comprehensible to readers and simple and also addresses the IPC comments, in a short period of time.
- 39 It was agreed that IPC would take on the task of changing the questionnaire to accommodate the IPC(JW) comments (AP:IPC).

- 40 USPS indicated that this issue has dragged on for some time now and now needs to be accelerated.

XVII. DCG work plan

POC SB DCG 2006.2 Doc 17

- 41 The work plan was revised and is in annex 3.

XVIII. Any other business

- 42 Code list 121(Receptacle Type). IPC presented an issue that had been raised as regards the reported need for a receptacle type to handle pallets. The issue is that code list 158 (Container Type) has code PA for pallet but code list 121 (Receptacle Type) has no such value. IPC explained that code list 121 references EDIFACT code list 7065 whereas code list 124 references EDIFACT code list 8053. A code value for pallet is not the same in the two EDIFACT code lists. IPC asked for confirmation that a code value for pallet as a receptacle type was indeed needed. SE provided this confirmation noting that receptacles that consist of pallets of printed papers is quite common. It was suggested by IPC, and agreed, that IB would request code value PX to be assigned by EDIFACT in their code list 8053. (AP:IB).
- 43 The IB raised the point that, of all the code lists published by UPU there are few that have references to EDIFACT and wondered if it was really necessary to sustain this principle that was adopted many years ago, especially for the receptacle-type code list. IPC explained the background that led to this current state.
- 44 The IB suggested that DCG members investigate any other requirements they might have concerning receptacle type codes. SE reported that, with the introduction of a code for pallets, that SE requirement are met. The other DCG members were asked to please investigate.(AP: All).
- 45 Code List 120 (Format of Contents). SE reported that the REIMS group had planned to submit a request to delete codes C and R from this list. Discussion centred on whether to delete or to add a note saying, in effect, the code had been deleted. The IB agreed to contact the PTC to see whether IPS (as an example) makes any reference to notes associated with code values – or are all codes loaded to the application systems? (AP:IB)
- 46 Code list 115 (Mail Category). There was discussion on Mail Category D. It remains problematic, but no definitive action was agreed.

XIX. Date and place of next meeting

- 47 The chairman explained that consideration is being given to having the next meeting at IATA in Montreal rather than in the USA as originally planned. This is to integrate with planned sub-group meetings between UPU and IATA The IB will contact IATA to ensure all the arrangements can be in place and will advise the chairman and members as soon as possible.(AP:IB)

- 48 Thus the next DCG (and PEG /EXG) meetings are:
DCG 2006.3 Montreal (IATA – to be confirmed) 13 September PM, 14 September and 15 September AM 2006
DCG 2006.4 Berne, 7 and 8 December 2006
DCG 2007.1 Venue TBD, 1 and 2 March 2007
DCG 2007.2 Venue TBD, 31 May and 1 June 2007
DCG 2007.3 Venue TBD, 13 and 14 September 2007

Nick Glynn

Chairman

Annexes:

- 1 List of participants
- 2 Action Point List
- 3 Revised DCG work plan
- 4 Metrics for standards usage
- 5 GB/CSC presentation on migrating code lists to XML

Data and Code Definition Group DCG 2006.2
9 June 2006 Konstanz
List of attendees

Organisation	Name of participant	e-mail address
GB-Royal Mail (chair)	Nick Glynn	nick.glynn@royalmail.com
FI-Finland Post	Harri Simonen	harri.simonen@posti.fi
FR-La Poste, France	Bernard Rouillé	bernard.rouille@laposte.fr
GB	Suzanne Dougherty	sdougherty@csc.com
PT-Portugal	Jose Pessoa	jose.m.pessoa@ctt.pt
SE Posten AB	Lars-Erik Torstenson	lars-erik.torstenson@posten.se
US-USPS (co-chair)	Himesh Patel	himesh.a.patel@usps.gov
IPC	John Wells	john.wells@ipc.be
IPC	Monique Herssens	monique.herssens@ipc.be
CEN / Pitney Bowes	Leon Pintsov	leon.pintsov@pb.com
CEN / Siemens	Jürgen Schad	juergen.schad@siemens.com
UPU/IB	Brian Gaudette	brian.gaudette@upu.int
Apologies		
CEN / Pitney Bowes	Leon Pintsov	leon.pintsov@pb.com

Action Point List from DCG 2006.2**POC SB DCG 2006.2 Report Annex 2**

*Note: PEG references start at 101, EXG at 201, DCG at 301

Ref*	Meeting number and paragraph / action	Action by
301	2005.1.3 Prepare and submit a proposal for an EDIFACT code usage register for the next DCG meeting	IPC
302	2005.1.9 Prepare and update to S27 to take account of changes to ISO/IEC 15434	IPC
303	2005.3.13 Correct errors in M84 highlighted by IPC	IPC (for clarification) then IB
304	2005.3.14 Update M5, i.e. incorporate UPU EDI Messaging Standards M30-M37	IPC
305	2005.4.1 Follow up on the issue brought to the CAPE Steering Committee's attention concerning the main sources of the incorrect data used in TDT segments including origin of message and type of message.	IPC
306	2006.1.20 Put P25 (Document identification and bar coding) on agenda for 2006.3 (September 2006)	IB
307	2006.1.25 Provide IPC with the service indicator codes, by product, that currently exist for both international and domestic items. This refers to the 2 character prefix of both domestic and international products.	US GB SE PT
308	2006.2.10 Refer the issue of IPC assigned codes to IPC requesting that IPC take action on code J1CFRC and any other such codes that may exist in IPC systems.	IB
309	2006.2.13 Submit report to DCG chairman regarding CAM member's statement that the IB is "extraordinarily reluctant" to challenge postal administrations on new IMPC codes.	IB
310	2006.2.15 Action the 3 USPS codes requested and send a reminder to USPS regarding the qualifier component of the code.	IB
311	2006.2.16 Prepare a draft of a revised IMPC registration form	IB
312	2006.2.17 Suggest interim solutions to the issues of the IMPC system not handling IMPC attributes for import being differ from export.	IB
313	2006.2.17 Suggest interim solutions to the issues of the system registering an IMPC that has modified attributes as being a "closed IMPC".	IB
312	2006.2.20 Provide comments on the requirements and benefits of a revised web-based system for handling IMPC registrations as per DCG 2006.2 Doc 8.	All
313	2006.2.24 Contact the PTC to determine the level of technical support PTC can provide as regards changing the systems and business processes that create code lists as an element of the migration to XML.	IB

314	2006.2.24 To support migration to XML, visit the IB to review the business processes and systems that are used to create codes lists.	GB/CSC
315	2006.2 25 Submit proposal for IMPC-defined Mail Subclass Codes to SB 2006.3	IPC
316	2006.2.25 Update code lists to support IMPC-defined Mail Subclass Codes	IB
317	2006.2.28 Update the document on <i>Aggregate Mailstream Segregation Codes</i> and send it to meeting participants.	IB
318	2006.2.28 Provide the requested information on planned use of <i>Aggregate Mailstream Segregation Codes</i> and any comments, within 3 weeks.	GB US SE PT FI FR
319	2006.2.30 Consult with IATA on the proposed solution to the issue of the location codes in CARDIT messages.	IB/GB
320	2006.2.34 Provide comment on the business aspects of the potential new data flow to support postal closed transit (as per DCG 2006.2 Doc 14)	All
321	2006.2.37 Submit proposal for glossary change to SB 2006.3	IPC
322	2006.2.39 Revise the questionnaire on the use of event E and item Customs retention code in EMSEVT messages as developed by the IB, in order to accommodate comments of IPC(JW).	IPC
323	2006.2.42 Request code PX for pallet in EDIFACT code list 8053	IB
324	2006.2.44 Identify any new requirements for receptacle type codes.	All
325	2006.2.45 Investigate with the PTC the aspect of either deleting specific code values such as C and R in Format of Contents or adding a note to the code value. Contact the PTC to see whether IPS makes any reference to notes associated with code values – or are all codes loaded to the application system.	IB
326	2006.2.47 Confirm the next meeting logistics with IATA and advise DCG members.	IB

DCG Work Plan – from DCG 2006.2

Item Number	Task	Activities	Outputs	Lead	Completion Date
1	Finalise mail classification standard (most recent version: DCG 2001.2-Doc 6) (P6)	Resolution of mail sub-class at aggregate level, dispatch codes	Update Final proposal	IPC	pending testing of PREDES V3 TBD
2	Develop a standard approach for the use of UPU member-defined codes in electronic messages	Define and document how the UPU member-defined codes should be used	Document standard approach to the use of UPU member-defined codes	IPC	Sep 06
3	Identify codes in UPU messages that are potential EDIFACT code requests	Scan all UPU EDI messages	List of codes that need to be raised with the EDIFACT Board (7065 and 8053 completed)	IPC	Sep 06
4	Determine how data identifiers can be included in EDI messages other than PREDES (complementary to 3)	Discuss requirements for updating other messages Document proposal for handling DIs Seek ISO 15418 Maintenance Committee Agreement Apply for required 3055 EDIFACT codes	Report Agreement on how data identifiers are handled in UPU EDI messages Agreement EDIFACT codes	IPC IPC IPC IPC	Oct 06 Oct 06 Oct 06
5	Issuer codes (P8)	Develop proposal for SB into several parts Editorial clarification/Mods	Proposed updates of relevant standards Proposed updates of relevant	PEG/ EXG IPC	Oct 06 Oct 06

Item Number	Task	Activities	Outputs	Lead	Completion Date
		Resolve country of destination questions	standards Proposed updates of relevant standards	IPC	Oct 06
		Resolve S32 consignment identifier	Proposed update of S32	IPC	Oct 06
6	Receptacle Asset Numbering	Check M84 terminology in respect of EDIFACT 7065 and 8053		IPC	Oct 06
7	EDIFACT code usage register		Proposed register	IPC	Dec 06
8	Review the possible methods of publication for code lists as XML files. (Reference 2005.2.1)			GB	Sep 06

POC SB PEG 2006.2 Report Annex 4

POC SB EXG 2006.2 Report Annex 4

POC SB DCG 2006.2 Report Annex 4

Ross Hinds
UPU Standards Board
Berne
29 March 2006

International **Post**
Corporation

Metrics for Standards Use

Metrics for Standards Usage

- **Use of standards the measure of success**
- **Automated measures preferred**
 - EDI messages & associated codes
 - Physical encoding
 - Financial services
- **Readily available manual data**
 - Data definition & encoding

Message use examples

(from IPC databases for December 2005)

Letters	PREDES v1	PREDES v2	PREDES v3
Messages	15,000 (12%)	108,000 (88%)	≈100 (0%)
Admins	14	42	2

Items	EMSEVT v0	EMSEVT v1
Messages	44,000 (15%)	270,000 (85%)
Admins	86	101

XML Code Lists

- Request from Jean-Marc Coeffic at PTC
- Work undertaken by CSC (GB) with assistance from JW
- First draft presented at Sep 2005 meeting
- Comments from meeting and JW incorporated
- Review by Siemens :
 - 1. Ease of use to create HTML to display the info as per above on the UPU site
 - 2. Ease of use to upload the code list data for use in an application
 - 3. Ease of use by applications to validate values in the code list?
- Changes presented at Dec 2005 meeting
- Comments from JW, eg separation of column heading details from the table entry rows
- Decision to ask Jean-Marc to review

XML Code Lists contd

1) It seems that the html page you provided is a dynamic html, working on the client side. I guess this is for demo purposes and it will be replaced by a server-side script loading and formatting the XML into the page. Right?

2) The XML pages will sit on the web server and will be available for download. I guess a second link will be added in the code list page for this XML download (page http://www.upu.int/standards/en/lists/upu_code_lists.shtml). Am I right?

Is the standards group aware of this and in agreement?