



## STANDARDS BOARD

### ELECTRONIC EXCHANGE GROUP (EXG)

Konstanz, 8 June 2006

#### Report

- 1 The 2006.2 EXG meeting was held in Konstanz on 8 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 EXG 2006.2 Doc 1

- 2 The agenda was adopted, but the order of the agenda was changed to facilitate timing. The chairman welcomed Mr Piotr Piotrowski of the UPU Addressing Group and Mr Vincent Brahamcha representing CEN (Solystics). Messrs Piotrowski and Brahamcha were in attendance for agenda item 7 concerning P14 (EDI messaging for addressing information).

#### II. Report of last meeting

POC SB EXG 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) 2005.4.18 Review PREDES V1.1 usage and report to the 2006.2 EXG meeting with a view to asking the 2006.3 SB to withdraw PREDES V1.1

*The IB had contacted the PTC and the EMS Unit and had also sent a report based on IPC's CAPE Vision to EXG members showing the current usage of PREDES V1 and V2 by country and by product. The IB explained this report at the meeting. Discussion centred on whether is preferable to proceed to withdraw PREDES V1 or to first develop a change /communication plan. The IB explained that part of the issue is perception in that PREDES V2 is associated with including item-level data. PREDES V1, on the other hand, is associated with not providing item-level data. Technically this is not accurate as the item level data in PREDES V2 is not mandatory. Thus PREDES V2 enables this feature but does not require it. A problem is that this is not well understood amongst UPU members. And neither is the impact of withdrawing a standard that is in use. The IB showed examples of countries sending PREDES V2 but not including item-level data .This defeats the original purpose of PREDES V2. Withdrawing a standard that is being used, without a communication plan, may be problematic. However another issue is "What is the EXG striving to achieve by withdrawing this standard?" An objective of expanding the use of PREDES V2 with item-level data is worthwhile but possibly is not an EXG issue. It was agreed that this issue warrants further consideration and will not be on the 2006.3 SB agenda. This continues to be an EXG action point.*

ii) 2006.1.3 Amend the 2005.4 meeting report and 2006.1.4 Table, at 2006.2 Standards Board, the process for documenting amended meeting reports

*The IB explained that SB 2006.2 ran out of time and did not cover this agenda item. Thus there is not yet an agreed process for amending such reports. However the specific amendment to 2005.4 has been well communicated and it is not a pressing business issue. The issue is on the 2006.3 Standards Board agenda. This continues to be an EXG action point*

iii) 2006.1.12 Send the existing information on PREDES V2 and V3 / CN 31 / CP 87 comparison to EXG members

*The IB had sent the reports to EXG members. USPS noted that they had not received any formal feedback from the group. Some work has been undertaken by a number of posts but input is required from more members of the EXG. This continues to be an EXG action point for all.*

*(For information, the original meeting reference in 2005.4.25 is: "The USPS provided a detailed comparison between PREDES V2 and forms CN 31 and CP87. It suggested that the comparisons could be shared with the EXG and others, which could then review the comparisons and suggest updates (e.g. certain data elements that could be deduced from manual tasks). (AP: GB/PT/FI) IPC volunteered to add a comparison column for PREDES V3 (AP: IPC). The comparison reviews would then be forwarded to the IB Secretariat by 10 February 2006, and then collated and presented to the 2006.1 EXG meeting. (AP: IB)..."*

iii) 2006.1.16 Provide comments on use of EVTRPT as alternative to RES and EXCEPT messages

*IPC advised that no comments had been received prior to the meeting. However, at the meeting GB gave an update indicating that they had done an analysis. The result is that moving to EVTRPT is possible but there is no demonstrated added business value to GB that would warrant the change. In the case of using EVTRPT to report non-receipt of items or receptacles, GB reported that the business logic for this would be quite complex and this is not considered do-able at this stage. PT also advised that they have no plan to migrate to EVTRPT. This was deleted as an EXG action point.*

iv) 2006.1.17 Provide comment on suggestion to not publish the diagram of chain of physical movement and roles of postal administrations

*The IB advised that the only comment that had been received was from GB who had agreed with the suggestion. This was deleted as an EXG action point.*

### **III. SB 2006.2 report**

POC SB 2006.2 –Report

- 4 The IB presented the report. 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**

- 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 DCG meeting agenda being held the next day.

#### **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. Report on MEDICI Project (IPC)**

POC SB EXG 2006.2 Doc 6

- 9 IPC gave a presentation of the MEDICI project to the EXG. IPC indicated that there had been substantial discussions between participating posts and there has been agreement in principle to use the ITMATT message for the MEDICI project. GB is developing the capability to send and receive ITMATT, but indicated that would also like to continue to with UPIMEX to test item content data exchange.
- 10 There was discussion on the potential expansion of the character set used for messages within MEDECI. On one hand there is the desirability to accommodate more alphabets so as to become more user-friendly in wider geographic areas. And on the other hand, the business and technical issues, particularly applying certain characters to applications, are significant. This issue was left for further exploration, with no specific action point allocated.
- 11 The EXG agreed with the allocation of new code lists 179 and 183 and this was referred to DCG which met on the following day. (Note that DCG also approved them as part of the CAM report). These new code lists will be added to the list (AP:IB).
- 12 EXG approved the proposed changes in standards for the MEDICI project to be presented to the Standards Board (AP:IPC).
- 13 The IB raised the subject of annex 1 of the document titled *MEDICI Overall Plan - Rev 2 Public Version* that is now on the UPU public website.
- i) The IB commented that this is a very extensive and aggressive plan – there are a significant number of complex action points in the plan. IPC explained that although the work plan in the document has 9 components (WP1-WP9), the MEDECI participants have so far committed to completing 2 components - WP1 (Project Initiation) and WP2 (Initial Development and Proof of Concept).
- ii) The IB suggested that the MEDICI participants and the project time frame should be included as information. IPC advised that the participants are Australia, Great Britain, Germany, Canada, USA, and Netherlands and that WP2 (Initial Development and Proof of Concept) is targeted for completion by end-March 2007.
- iii) The IB asked for clarification of section 3.2 (Item identification) where the IB interpretation of this was that, as result of the project, items would have 2 identifiers – one for the item itself and one for the customs declaration. This clarification was requested in light of recent regulatory changes reinforcing S10 and other initiatives directed towards having a single identifier on an item. IPC clarified that this was not the intended interpretation of this section of the plan.
- iv) The IB thanked IPC for these clarifications.

**VII. P14 EDI Message for addressing information (proposal to develop standard EDI messages to facilitate name and address information exchange) (IB)**

POC SB EXG 2006.2 Doc 7

- 14 Mr Piotr Piotrowski from the UPU Addressing Group (UPU-AG), along with Mr Vincent Brahamcha representing CEN (Solystic), presented the contents of document 7 outlining the current state of P14.
- 15 UPU-AG explained the background of the P14 including the relationship of P14 to standard S42. UPU-AG and CEN (Solystic) also explained the background as to the joint work efforts of UPU and CEN in this regard.
- 16 UPU-AG advised the EXG that, since progress has now been made on S42, the Addressing Group is now prepared to take the lead on P14. This would be done by the POC Addressing technological sub-project team. This team is led by USPS and consists of USPS – chairman, France, Great Britain, Finland, Portugal, Japan, PostCom, ICC (International Chamber of Commerce), Mailing industry – Allies computing, First Logic, Pitney Bowes.
- 17 In so doing however, the UPU-AG advised that they would want to establish strong connections with the EXG as the linkage to the Standards Board and welcomes input and assistance from EXG members. UPU-AG also noted the need to increase the level of knowledge, within the group, about electronic transmission of addresses.
- 18 CEN (Solystic) also made reference to the importance of ensuring that CEN standard 14142 and UPU Standard S42 are compatible.
- 19 In discussion, IPC noted initial plans of CEN for address and names standardization in 5 main subject groupings: address components (resulted S42a); templates S42b; electronic exchange (P 14); validation – pending; decomposition of components from line oriented address. As well, USPS noted the need to keep the issue of privacy in mind.
- 20 UPU-AG suggested that an initial progress report on P14 could be made to the EXG in September 2006.
- 21 The EXG agreed with the suggestion that the UPU Addressing Group take the lead on P14 and that the EXG could be the link to the Standards Board. The EXG also agreed that a September time frame for an initial progress report is quite satisfactory. The chairman and EXG members confirmed their willingness to support the UPU Addressing Group as required.
- 22 The chairman thanked Messrs Piotrowski and Brahamcha for their efforts in coming to the EXG to present this important work item.

**VIII. Changes to M17 EMSEVT**

POC SB EXG 2006.2 Doc 8

- 23 The IB presented a proposal for a minor change to the EMSEVT message. The change is in the general information section and is to illustrate that the message is for more than EMS. The IB explained that this proposal could be considered a “minimal change approach” and believes such an approach is warranted in this case. The reasons are included in the meeting document and were explained to EXG. The suggested wording is:

*The EMSEVT message is the implementation of the exchange of events originally relating to international EMS items. It was first defined in 1986 by a group of representatives of postal administrations and IPC International Post Corporation – then called UNIPOST.*

*The EMSEVT message is now used for more than EMS. It is used for any postal product with a 13 character item identifier. This includes registered or insured letter post, express items, and*

parcels.

The examples in this document do, however, refer only to EMS items.

- 24 IPC suggested that reference to “13 characters” be removed. The IB pointed out that the message standard itself refers to 13 character item identifiers. IPC said that there is a case where an administration uses has a 12 character id and pads the 13 character data element in the message with a blank. It was then agreed to remove reference to the 13 characters.
- 25 IPC suggested that the also PEB be asked to investigate M17 so as to also remove other references to EMS in the body of the standard.
- 26 The EXG agreed with the initial change (adjusted to remove the reference to 13 characters) and requested the IB to submit this to a subsequent Standards Board. (AP:IB). The EXG also agreed with referring this to PEB for further potential changes.(AP:PEB).

**IX. CEN Statement of mailing submission (CEN / Pitney Bowes)**  
POC SB EXG 2006.2 Doc 9

- 27 CEN (Pitney Bowes) gave an oral presentation based on doc 9 noting that from the perspective of CEN, there is an issue concerning SMS that should be resolved. It is noted that SMS is continuing through CEN process without significant objections of all European Posts and soon is expected to be an approved CEN TS (Technical Specification) that is supposed to become a UPU standard in due course.
- 28 Discussion indicated that the CEN standard likely could not be adopted by UPU but possibly UPU could use the CEN work as input.
- 29 The IB asked if there is a demand for this from postal administrations. CEN advised that it has been on the back burner for several years and CEN is raising it now so as to get a decision to either progress the issue it or to close it as a joint work item.
- 30 It was noted that, as this was initially a joint UPU CEN initiative, there are formalities to be applied whichever direction is taken.
- 31 CEN indicated that, as of recently, Deutsche Post has adopted the CEN standard. The EXG agreed that a good approach would be to consult with Deutsche Post on this issue as to their experience with the standard. CEN (Siemens) agreed to make the initial contact with Deutsche Post.(AP:CEN(Siemens))

**X. EXG work plan**  
POC SB EXG 2006.2 Doc 10

- 32 The work plan, attached as Annex 3, was reviewed, amended and approved by the EXG. This resulted in an action item for CEN to send the open interface standard for barcode printers to EXG (AP:CEN/Siemens).

**XI. Presentation of Nordic project group work on using PREDES information for accounting (SE)**

- 33 SE gave a presentation on a Nordic initiative on the Automation of the Accounting Process. The project involves basing the accounting on the PREDES V2 message. SE advised that their project requires no changes to the current PREDES V2 standard. An objective of the project is to have paperless mail exchange, using only PREDES V2 – no CN31 Letter Bill. The presentation is in annex 5. It is noted that the Nordic solution for IBRS accounting is to use

the PREDES elements normally used for *Weight of parcels subject to inward rates* and the *Number of parcels subject to inward rates*.

- 34 The Chairman thanked SE for this informative presentation and indicated that the EXG will appreciate further updates as this initiative progresses.

## **XII. Any Other Business**

- 35 There was no other business.

## **XIII. Date and place of next meetings**

- 36 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)

- 37 Thus the next EXG (and PEG /DCG) meetings are:

EXG 2006.3	Montreal (IATA – to be confirmed) 13 September PM, 14 September and 15 September AM 2006
EXG 2006.4	Berne, 7 and 8 December 2006
EXG 2007.1	Venue TBD, 1 and 2 March 2007
EXG 2007.2	Venue TBD, 31 May and 1 June 2007
EXG 2007.3	Venue TBD, 13 and 14 September 2007

Nick Glynn  
EXG Chairman

### **Annexes:**

- 1 List of participants
- 2 Action Point List
- 3 Revised EXG work plan
- 4 Metrics for standards usage
- 5 SE presentation on Automation of Accounting Process

**Electronic Exchange Group EXG 2006.2**  
**8 June 2006 Konstanz**  
**List of attendees**

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

**Apologies**

There were no apologies

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

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

<b>Ref</b>	<b>Meeting number and paragraph / action</b>	<b>Action by</b>
201	2005.1.3 Check the proposed content of code list 160 as presented in Doc 5 of EXG 2004.3 and confirm with IPC	IPC /USPS
202	2005.4.18 Review PREDES V1.1 usage and report to the 2006.2 EXG meeting with a view to asking the 2006.3 SB to withdraw PREDES V1.1	IB
203	2005.4.20 Produce an updated diagram, liaise with CEN representative and suggest where to publish diagram; present diagram at the 2006.3 EXG meeting	IPC
204	2005.4.25 Review USPS comparisons of PREDES V2 and CN 31 and CP 87 forms by EXG members	All
205	2005.4.28 Determine whether the original USPS image header specification can be released for wider circulation	USPS
206	2005.4 28 Contact the original members of the image exchange ad-hoc group (including suppliers and postal operators) to discuss the group's re-activation in order to gauge the level of postal interest before a decision could be taken to relinquish the project lead to CEN	IPC
207	2006.1.3 Amend the 2005.4 meeting report (once the process is agreed at Standards Board).	IB
208	2006.1.17 Provide comment on suggestion to not publish the diagram of chain of physical movement and roles of postal administrations	All
209	2006.1.11 Allocate new code lists 179 and 183	IB
210	2006.2.12 Propose changes in standards for the MEDICI project to the Standards Board 2006.3	IPC
211	2006.2.26 present changes to M17 EMSEVT V1 to Standards Board to clarify that it does not apply only to EMS.	IB / PEB
212	2006.2.31 Make the initial contact with Deutsche Post on their use of the CEN standard for SMS.	CEN (Siemens)
213	2006.2.32 Send the open interface standard for barcode printers to EXG	CEN/ Siemens
214	2006.2.36 Confirm the next meeting logistics with IATA and advise EXG members.	IB



**EXG Work Plan**

Item Number	Task	Activities	Outputs	Lead	Completion Date
1	Review and revise UPIMEX/UPIRES	Comparison of UPIMMEX and ITMATT to determine if a standard message is needed.	Knowledge for determination of requirement specifications.	CDIG	2006
		Review messages with WCO	Agreement on the amendments with WCO	CDIG	TBD
2	Address message requirements for license plates	Complete M30-M37 specifications	Complete examples	IPC	On-going
3	Update dispatch-level pre-advice message		Descriptions PREDES usage levels 3 and 0		Mar 06
			Descriptions for EVTRPT usage levels		Mar 06
			Recommend action for PRECON, CARDIT, etc		Mar 06
4	Testing of M30-M37	Phase 2	PREDES V3 usage levels 03 and 00		TBD
			AGATT		TBD
			ITMATT		Dec 06
			EXCEPT, RESCON		Oct 06
			RESDES replacement by EVTRPT		TBD

Item Number	Task	Activities	Outputs	Lead	Completion Date
5	Electronic statement of mailing	Prepare status 0 proposal		IPC	Oct 06
6	Item image exchange P5	Revive image exchange working group		IPC	June 06
7	M5 update to cover new messages	Revise and incorporate M30 to M37 and include chain of physical movement	Revised standards	IPC/GB	June 06
8	Claims inquiries and verification notes	Electronic equivalent of CN08 CN21 and possibly CN28		PTA ad-hoc group	Dec 06
		Revised procedures for claim and inquiry handling		PTA ad-hoc group	Dec 06
		Electronic equivalent for handling CN43		PTA ad-hoc group	TBD
9	PREDES / CN31 review	Compare data elements in CN31 and PREDES	Recommended updates to PREDES message specification (M14 and M36)	USPS EXG	Sep06
10	Review possible methods migrating M38 MONORD and RESORD to XML files (standards as XML)		Proposal	GB	December 06
11	Review UPU message specifications PRECON, PREDES to determine the need for and adapt if necessary to allow update and cancellation				TBD
12	Provide mechanism for indicating the extent of pre-sorting within an aggregate (e.g. unsorted, sorted, REIMS level II, etc)				TBD
13	Open Standard Interfact between Image Handler and OCR or video encoding P24	CEN formal vote	CEN TS	CEN	June 06
		UPU endorsement		EXG	Dec 06

Item Number	Task	Activities	Outputs	Lead	Completion Date
14	Open standard interface for barcode printers				Sep 06
15	Investigate need for a mechanism for a carrier to report allocation of a new identifier to a receptacle		Decision if it's a requirement	IPC	Mar 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

# Automation of accounting process

Presentation by the Nordic work group



# Phases

- 1 PREDES as base for accounting
- 2 Electronic Verification note (CN43)
- 3 Electronic accounting forms





# Phase 1

- 1 Agreed requirements (23 May)
- 2 Presentation for Nordic International Managers (15 June)
- 3 Start sending 1 January 2007



# Phase 2 and 3

Take part in existing work groups e.g.

- REIMS OTG subgroup on EDI
- UPU SB DCG subgroup on Claims, inquiries and verification notes



# Requirements (in addition to PREDES V2)

- Receptacle weight must be net
- Format is mandatory
- Receptacle mail subclass is mandatory
- Item level information mandatory for registered and insured



# IBRS

Not included in Nordic solution but data  
can be sent in despatch level MEA  
segments



# Benefits

Harmonised PREDES information make it possible for PPO to skip manual registration of CN31

No need to send CN43 just for the sake of missing CN31

