



## STANDARDS BOARD

Brussels, 9 July 2008

### Draft report

1 The 2008.3 Standards Board (SB) meeting was held in Brussels on 9 July 2008. The list of participants is at Annex 1. The main conclusions of the meeting are listed below. An action point list showing all the points on which action by a particular party is expected appears at the end of this report.

#### I. Opening of meeting and adoption of agenda

POC SB 2008.3–Doc 1.Rev 1

2 The Chair reminded participants of the Standards Board IPR policy. A presence list was circulated to record participants' names, organisations and email addresses. This document will be on file at the IB. The order of discussion of agenda items was changed to accommodate participants' requests and logistical issues. One item was added under AOB: Norwegian request for an IMPC code.

#### II. Report of last meeting

POC SB 2008.2–Draft Report

3 The 2008.2–Draft report was approved for publication as a final report on the UPU website, subject to correction of the work item number at AP 0053 to read P35.

4 Regarding the update of definition of 'postal item' in the Glossary and further to AP:0038, the DCG found that the change in the basic definition of service versus item required further study. IPC had started preparing a revised proposal for this definition. But the USPS had asked more time to consider this issue, which will be discussed again in the next DCG meeting.

5 Regarding AP:0040, responses to the questionnaire on EMAI had been sent to IPC. These would be reviewed by the ID-tag working group at its next meeting.

6 Except for the following, all action items were either completed or on the 2008.3 agenda:

Action No.	Action	Action by
0032	SB 2008.1 (65) Develop a proposal requesting that POC approve M14 at status 2, and withdraw M11.	IB
0038	SB 2008.2 (8) Include a note in the standard P28 for the particular definition of postal item in its context.	PEB
0041	SB 2008.2 (35) Draft a document about certification of S42 to be evaluated and commented at the next SB meeting.	ASG
0042	SB 2008.2 (53) Review the work item proposal on Geocoding in postal codes and resubmit it for status P approval to the 2008 July SB meeting.	CEN/ASG

Action No.	Action	Action by
0050	SB 2008.2 (92) Inform SB of the scope and relative importance of the USA issued patents to S43.	USA

### III. Reports on activities

#### a *Data and Code Definition Group*

POC SB DCG 2008.2–Draft Report

7 The 2008.2 DCG and EXG meetings were held together. The report was presented by Great Britain who noted that PREDES V 2.1 was endorsed to for being submitted to this meeting as a status 2 proposal. There was an update on the IATA/UPU Group on EDI Issues report which led to an agreement to wait until the USA, as the primary proponent of the transport leg rate code, further studies the issue and comes back to the group with a formal proposal.

8 The Group had noted that the proposed RFID Standards Group may need AGGATT and had suggested deferring a decision on this question. The group had also concluded that there was merit in withdrawing PREDES V3, but that it was premature to do so. It was agreed that no further work would be done on both specifications for the time being.

9 The DCG had also agreed with GB's proposal to include codes UA-UZ in the code list associated with S10e, for bilateral use only and without the rules previously stated. It was decided to have a single rule allowing the use of UA-UZ bilaterally for the identification of letter post items for which Customs data is exchanged electronically between participants.

10 The full DCG/EXG draft report can be found on the UPU website, but is still subject to revision at the next meeting. The next meetings of DCG/EXG/PEG will be held in France (Nantes) from 10–11 September 2008.

#### b *Electronic Exchange Group*

POC SB EXG 2008.2–Draft Report

11 The 2008.2 EXG report was jointly presented with the DCG report by Great Britain (see paragraphs 7 to 10).

#### c *Physical Exchange Group*

POC SB PEG 2008.2–Draft Report

12 The 2008.1 PEG report was presented by the USA. Two work items were presented for closure—P9: Facing identification marks for letters, and P 11 (Address block locators). As there are CEN standards on these subjects, both would be annotated as being “on hold” and the description in the Catalogue of UPU Standards updated to reflect the existence of the CEN standard.

13 P10: Process management and tracking of mail aggregates had its status retained and had been referred to the new RFID Standards Group and IPC to examine the probability of its use in mail performance monitoring projects.

14 Regarding the need for a new group on RFID, it had been agreed that a revised terms of reference and an RFID standards development strategy would be developed collaboratively by IPC and the IB.

15 The full draft report can be accessed on the UPU website, but is still subject to revision at the next meeting. The next meeting will be held in France (Nantes) from 10– 11 September 2008.

#### d *IATA/UPU Group on EDI Issues*

POC SB IATA–UPU 2008.1–Draft Report

16 Since the 2008.2 IATA/UPU Group on EDI Issues meeting was postponed to 28 October 2008, there were no outstanding issues to be presented.

17 The USA reported a meeting of the Future of Mail by Air (FOMBA) project held on 18 April 2008 in Washington. Twenty-five airlines attended. A minor change in M39 is expected to correct the element used to identify receptacles.

18 The full draft report can be accessed on the UPU website, but is still subject to revision at the next meeting.

**e      *Customs Data Interchange Group***  
POC SB CDIG 2008.2–Draft Report

19 The CDIG report was presented by Great Britain. Referring to the 2008.3 CDIG meeting held the previous day, it indicated a significant increase of ITMATT traffic, reaching a peak of more than 100,000 messages per week. Quality checking had been performed on data related to HS codes and item description.

20 It highlighted discussions on the IB's document on work item P33. It was agreed to revise and reword this document so as to present it as a proposal rather than as a solution to impacted stakeholders.

21 The full draft report can be accessed on the UPU website, but is still subject to revision at the next meeting. The next meeting will be held in Berne on 29 October 2008.

**f      *CEN TC 331***

22 CEN made a report on the CEN TC 331 Plenary meeting. The WG5 would be re-instated to cover private letter boxes. Its next meeting will be held in Copenhagen on 28 November 2008.

23 CEN's new postal directives for topics of standardisation, including discussions with customers and postal operators, had been reported to the European Parliament. WG2 was re-activated under co-convenorship (Mr. Walter Trezek and Mr. Jacob Johnson). Three items were approved:

- 00331076: Reverse hybrid mail standardisation
- 00331077: Mail switch standard for postal processing
- 00331078: Standardised preference database

24 WG1 will meet on 26 September in Rome to discuss measurement of the transit time of end-to-end services for single priority mail and 1<sup>st</sup> class mail.

25 An update of current work items within TC 331 and within the UPU Standards Board was given. Details can be seen at Annex 2.

26 CEN also reported on work item (not yet registered in CEN) *Open interface between scanner, image controller and machine control*. Agreement on a common standard for the system design document had not been reached as this depended on the technology used (Transmission Control Protocol/Internet Protocol (TCP/IP), Service-Oriented Architecture (SOA), Common Object Request Broker Architecture (CORBA), Extensible Markup Language (XML), or any other future extension). This part represented only 20% of the total amount of work.

27 Responding to IPC's question as to whether suppliers could communicate with other parties using different system design document standards, CEN clarified that each technology used should be specified and that each side should have the same technology implemented in order to communicate.

28 CEN had drafted a questionnaire on sequencing<sup>1</sup> in urban areas to be sent by the UPU to postal administrations that wanted to automate delivery sequencing or had already automated the delivery sequencing operation.

29 The Chairman noted that this could be a challenge of many postal organisations with cities with vertical delivery.

---

<sup>1</sup> Sequencing = ranking the mail pieces to deliver to the order needed by the postman all along his round (i.e. delivery point #1, delivery point #2, etc)

30 IPC noted that the delivery point concept is being used in a sense that differs from that defined in S42. It pointed out that, in S42, a post code was not necessarily the delivery point identifier. For instance, Australia has individual delivery point identifiers that have no structure but which still identify delivery points uniquely. Regarding routing and sequencing, structured codes are used to group one or more delivery points.

31 As the concept of sequencing used in the questionnaire differed from the concept used in S42, and as the target posts that should receive the questionnaire were not clear, the IB was requested to send the proposed questionnaire to IPC for analysis, and for proposing a way forward. (AP 0056:IPC)

**g Addressing Project Group TC**

32 The USA presented on behalf of the Addressing Standards Group (ASG) a report covering the UPU S42 International addressing standard, and work item P14 on the transmission of name and address data. The full report as well as a copy of the paper presented by this Group to the ISO TC 211 committee's workshop held on 25 May 2008 in Copenhagen can be found at Annex 3.

33 The USA recommended implementing S42 to IPC members that had not done so. IPC noted that the current version of S42 had been implemented in 11 countries. Six more countries are scheduled to implement in the near future.

34 The Chairman highlighted that a target to be pursued might be not only the number of countries, but also implementation scale and scope.

35 CEN stated that the address database needed to be parsed into UPU variables and that this might represent an obstacle for implementation by international mailers.

36 France noted that significant work needed to be done before implementing S42. There were no tools that allowed a company to retrieve S42-compliant data from the address database. User benefits were not clear. France emphasized that S42 was just a description; a description of how to use it therefore needed to be developed.

37 IPC confirmed that the process of parsing formatted address label into components was still missing. The CEN group that had worked with this topic had envisaged that this issue would be rather difficult and had left it to be examined later.

38 To answer a question about who would develop a solution to this problem, IPC suggested that this issue be included in the ASG's agenda as the next phase. A next step should be to investigate how to handle data in printed addresses, and how to deal with data retrieving and parsing aspects.

39 The Netherlands suggested that ASG define a list of countries that ASG would like to approach.

40 IPC noted that if implementing S42 was important for IPC members, it would not be difficult to fund a project to help ASG to progress. This project could include dealing with big customers to identify their needs.

41 Based on this feedback, SB will request ASG to present a document to the SB on addressing problems and other requirements about implementing S42 so that actions can be developed in this regard. (AP 0057:ASG)

**IV. UPU standards updates and progress reports**

**a PREDES V2.1 – Status 0 proposal**  
(POC SB 2008.3–Doc 4a)

42 The IB introduced this agenda item on behalf of the Operations and Accounting Review (OAR) Group by explaining key points from document 4a. This standard had been initiated by the OAR Group and developed in collaboration with SB working groups, IPC, and UPU members in order to enable electronic, or paperless, accounting for all postal products.

43 This specification had been endorsed by the 2008.2 DCG/EXG for status 0 submission. Some issues were raised to be reviewed with C33 group but not to hold up status 0 submission.

44 Since that time one business gap related to REIMS direct mail accounting had been identified. Timing did not permit to bring it back to the DCG.

45 The IB noted the intention to harmonise UPU standards, regulations and forms. The specification was consistent with Congress Proposal 62 (Postal air waybill numbers) in a way that any change to the UPU regulations related to the exchange of international postal flows would lead to a gradual elimination of the use of paper-based documentation and to a promotion of procedures based on electronic data capture and electronic data interchange (EDI).

46 This specification, targeting both technical developers and business people, was more user-friendly because of the following:

- regulatory and business issues defined;
- EDIFACT message specification – examples for each data element;
- narrative explanation of the branching diagram;
- extensive rules for building messages;
- examples have the complete business explanation adjacent;
- examples of segment clusters;
- section on differences from PREDES V2.0;
- intention to create a companion document that on the UPU website with more extensive business examples.

47 The IB pointed out that this specification intended to strike a balance between bilateral /multilateral agreement requirements on the one hand and keeping the message specification as simple as possible for the majority of users on the other. PTC had noted that the basic features of PREDES V2.1 were relatively simple to implement from a basis of PREDES V 2.0 and it could be incorporated into the PTC's current business plan to prepare an IPS implementation by September 2008, provided that status 0 is granted.

48 The Chairman of the DCG/EXG noted, as regards the project plan in annex 2, that new business requirements and technical modifications could come up as a result of the testing phase and those will need to be reviewed by the EXG.

49 The USA commented that this specification was a good model that developed EDI specifications in a practical manner and that better met the Posts' business needs.

50 IPC noted that business requirements for REIMS Direct Mail were not adequately covered in this specification. IB confirmed that it had collaborated with IPC and the PTC to define the solution and the specification would be subject to a new version to be submitted to the SB later.

51 The SB granted status 0 to the annexed draft for publishing. ([AP 0058:PEB/IB](#))

**b S11: Item tracking events – withdrawal proposal**  
(POC SB 2008.3–Doc 4b)

52 IPC presented this document. The S11 standard defines item tracking events, which were used in the TRAKIT V1.0 and TRAKIT V2.0. Since TRAKIT had been withdrawn, there was no reference to S11 in any other standard. The item tracking events used in EMSEVT series of standards were incorporated in these standards and there was thus no need to reference them in S11.

53 The 2008.2 DCG/EXG had endorsed the withdrawal of S11 and had additionally noted that code list 125 (TRAKIT event codes) could also be eliminated.

54 The SB agreed to withdraw S11 and eliminate code list 125. The updated catalogue of standards and the published code lists would reflect these changes. ([AP 0059:PEB/IB](#))

**c Postal Registered eMail (PReM) Functional Specification – Status 0 proposal**  
(POC SB 2008.3–Doc 4c)

55 The Chairman of the AESUG introduced this item seeking status 0 for the UPU functional specification for Postal Registered e-Mail (PReM). This specification, developed by Macao Post, stemmed from P36 that is a work item intended to enhance the traditional e-mail service so as to provide an end-to-end trusted electronic communication service, encompassing both evidence of submission and delivery between authenticated parties. The service consisted in the secured exchange of electronic mail, ensuring that every step of the process was logged for future evidence tracing and that any entity involved was authenticated.

56 The specification was drafted by the AES Users Group referencing verbs and syntax defined in S43: Secured electronic postal services (SePS) interface specification – Part A: Concepts, schemas and operations.

57 The AESUG Chairman stated that one of the reasons for seeking Status 0 was the belief that this could help claim trade mark rights on the term “PReM”.

58 Macao Post followed the introduction with an in-depth explanation of the specification content.

59 The USA expressed support for the specification but advised that it might have Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) issues. The USA would submit a list of patent claims to the IB secretariat to be considered. (AP 0060:IB)

*[Editor’s note: Subsequent to the SB meeting, the USA sent an email to the IB with the following list of patents and applications that may be relevant to the Postal registered email specification:*

US Patents granted

- 7,266,696 *Electronic postmarking without directly utilizing an electronic postmark server*
- 7,121,455 *Systems and methods for electronic postmarking including ancillary data*
- 7,159,238 *Enhanced browser application for service related to the transportation of a message*
- 6,917,948 *Systems and methods for providing electronic archiving*

US Patent Applications

- 20060231607 *Systems and methods for electronic postmarking including ancillary data background*
- 20040133524 *Systems and methods for electronic postmarking of data including location data*
- 20040117684 *Systems and methods for electronic postmarking including ancillary data*
- 20040034780 *Electronic postmarking without directly utilizing an electronic postmark server*
- 20030028764 *Secure universal postal encrypted resource (super) browser*
- 20020029279 *Methods and systems for proofing identities using a certificate authority*
- 20020029249 *Methods and systems for providing an electronic account to a customer*
- 20040128316 *Systems and methods for providing electronic archiving*

60 The USA noted that, as per their policy on previous patents, it would be based on reasonable fees and on a non-discriminatory approach.

61 IPC asked for clarification on page 3 of doc 4c, paragraph 12, second bullet, proposing a “non-published status 0” working draft. It also noted that any specification that gets status 0 is

published. The AESUG chairman clarified that this reference was ambiguous and that the intention was to apply for status 0 and publication, if status 0 was granted.

62 IPC was sympathetic to the proposed specification but made the following comments/suggestions:

- not all operations are yet fully defined (Send, Receive, Notify) and should be added to S43a;
- 5.2.2 to 5.2.2 would be better organised in time sequence, with party indicated in table, rather than organised by party;
- in 5.3 there is inconsistency in the treatment of Addressee/Delegate; it may be appropriate to work with the same distinction as exists for posts between addressee and authorised recipients;
- how messages are forwarded from origin to destination is lacking the concept of forwarding/transit operator. This would cover the cases where the origin administration and the delivery administration do not have a direct relationship. In this context, there would be a link to another standard that defines the trust path to be used in such communication;
- possible ambiguity of use of “Forward”;
- in 7.2, confusion between who generates evidence versus who wants it;
- number of formatting/content issues for PEB resolution such as:
  - definitions and definition numbering;
  - many typographic and grammatical errors;
  - terminology, acronyms need verification against other related standards, with common definitions to be moved to the Glossary;
  - in 6.2, it would be better not to give sub-clause cross-references to other documents as these could change; terms should be sufficient.

63 IPC noted that although formatting/content issues can be resolved by PEB, it would like to avoid the same situation experienced in the past with the original S43 when the issues that were to be resolved by the PEB were beyond the latter’s resolution power, and publication was delayed by about a year. It recommended that a revised draft be submitted to the next SB meeting in October 2008.

64 The AESUG Chairman acknowledged IPC’s comments and agreed to follow these recommendations.

65 Canada Post raised concerns about not including the key issue of identity management and authentication models (to identify who sends and who receives the message) in the current draft specification. It was also concerned about how the sender acknowledges that the recipient of the message is in a country that operates a registered e-mail service. Canada supported generally the work that had been done but was afraid that trying to implement this specification without considering this key issue it would not be possible.

66 The AESUG Chairman noted that, in their internal group discussion, Canada had been keen to have a solution to the identity management issue. He had currently preferred having status 0 granted in order to make the specification known to postal administrations so that they could work to develop their registered email services. He added that the identity issue could be added to the specification later.

67 As the graphics depicted in “Store and Forward logical model” and “Store and Notify logical model” were identical, IPC suggested this ambiguity be clarified.

68 France noted that this specification was more of a web service than a standard. In this context, it believed it would be important to explore several market aspects before launching it. The technical aspect (specification itself) should be addressed after covering these business issues.

69 France suggested a separate document to address the following topics:

- do postal administrations have the right to use ETSI developments?;

- whether there would be a market for registered e-mail service;
- what would be the Return on Investment for postal administrations;
- apportioning revenues between participants;
- who would be in charge of maintaining the quality of the product and of keeping all messages? Who would own the servers? Would they be centralised? Where?;
- pricing policy;
- competition and risks associated with business.
- are postal organisations the best in the market to provide this service?

70 The AESUG Chairman explained that the group had not planned to do a market investigation before starting to work towards status 0. He said that Italy already had a very similar application and that it had been supporting the development of this specification. He also noted that in the US market companies had launched similar services (e.g. DocuSign) and had indicated volumes of about 12 million transactions. He also pointed out another private company called RPost® that had products for business communications and had actually named a service as “Registered E-mail® services”.

71 Regarding the right of using ETSI developments, the AESUG Chairman noted that there was a verbal agreement to share developments between AESUG and ETSI. AESUG had participated in ETSI development work and a representative of Macao Post had joined the ETSI working group in charge of registered e-mail.

72 Regarding risks of competition, the AESUG Chairman pointed out that being exposed to risks is better than doing nothing and thus having no opportunities. He agreed that a marketing plan could address many issues raised by France.

73 The Chairman acknowledged that trademarks were not an SB matter. However, there were discussions on how to help AESUG to resolve the trade mark issue related to the name “PRem: Postal Registered eMail”.

74 The USA encouraged the AESUG to apply for a trade mark based on the granting of Status P by the SB in April 2008. IPC added that the catalogue of standards had a section in it related to *P36 Postal Registered e-Mail (PRem)* and observed that this is due to be published in August 2008.

75 The IB offered to liaise with the IB Legal Department to identify actions that might be taken. (AP 0061:IB)

76 France advised including a warning in the scope of the standard stating that there were market risks in pursuing implementation, and that was no guarantee of profits if any postal administration did so.

77 The Netherlands, complementing recommendations from Canada on identity management and authentication models, suggested addressing the level of trust as well.

78 Following a lengthy reply of technical issues provided by the Macao Post, the SB Chairman felt it not to be appropriate at this stage to re-open an in-depth discussion on technical details.

79 The SB also felt that more work needed to be done to Doc 4c before resubmitting it to the October SB in Berne. IPC, France, USA and Canada, coordinated by AESUG, were tasked to improve this document for status 0 approval. (AP 0062: AESUG)

80 The SB recognised the excellent work that had been done by Macao Post, on behalf of the AESUG, and encouraged the AESUG to go through the final steps to get status 0 approval.

## **V. RFID standards strategy & working group** (POC SB 2008.3–Doc 5)

81 IPC gave an overview of the UPU’s role in the development of RFID Standards, including a proposal to update the SB’s RFID standards development strategy. The PEG had endorsed the re-activation of a specialist group, assigning responsibility for RFID standards rather than the PEG,

yet reporting to PEG. This proposal also included a draft of the terms of reference for the new group.

82 The Terms of Reference had been revised in consultation with the IB and was endorsed by the AESUG Chair with a suggestion of using .post authenticated postal network to secure transactions.

83 The SB was requested to do the following:

- to review, refine and adopt the proposed strategy (Doc 5, paragraphs 27 and 28);
- agree the Terms of Reference for the RFID Standards Group (Doc 5, Annex 1);
- identify who could be the potential Chair of the Group, and give guidance on participation issues;

84 Following suggested amendments from the PEG and inputs from the AESUG Chairman, the SB was also asked to task the new group to:

- investigate the possibility for the UPU to publish ISO 18000 as UPU standards as separate parts of S23;
- assume responsibility for P10: Process management and tracking of mail aggregates ;
- consider RFID transaction security requirements and the use of .post as a means of satisfying these transactions.

85 The USA strongly supported the RFDI standards development strategy and agreed that the RFID Standards Group should be coordinated by the PEG. It also suggested inviting China to be the vice-chair in order to ensure coordination between the AESUG RFID subgroup (already chaired by China) and this new RFID standards group.

86 Denmark also supported the creation of the RFID standards group and noted the need to draft a milestone plan with tangible deliverables. IPC pointed out that one of the points of the Terms of Reference proposed is to develop, maintain and execute a work plan compliant with the UPU RFID Standards Development Strategy, thus covering Denmark's concerns.

87 The SB:

- approved the strategy proposed in Doc 5, paragraphs 27 and 28;
- accepted the Terms of Reference in Doc 5, Annex 1; ([AP 0063:PEB/IB](#))
- appointed Mr. Himesh Patel as the Chairman of the RFID standards group;
- requested the new Chairman to invite China (in its capacity as the Chairman of the AESUG RFID subgroup) to assume the vice-chairmanship of the RFID standards group and to invite AESUG participants to join it; ([AP 0064: RFID SG Chairman](#))
- tasked the RFID standards group as proposed by the IPC in paragraph 84. ([AP 0065:IB](#))

88 Canada, France, the Netherlands and IPC confirmed participation.

89 Concluding discussion on this topic, the USA gave a brief overview on the use RFID tags. The USA had participated in an IATA meeting and noted the latter's enthusiasm in using RFID despite restrictions in the use of active tags. The USPS had been working with the US Department of Homeland Security and the US Federal Aviation Administration to identify a protocol that could be used in active tags. In fact, this protocol existed but it required individual certification of each aircraft, which was infeasible. The USA noted that another IATA meeting with airlines is planned in October in Montreal to continue addressing RFID issues.

## **VI. Update of Standards Review Group (USA)** (POC SB 2008.3–Doc 6)

90 The USA presented a report from the Standards Review Group (SRG). This report stemmed from the 2007 POC request to support for a comprehensive report on selected standards. The SB had reviewed relevant data compiled by the IB and had agreed that the work should cover three broad areas of interest:

- specific standards (i.e., standards that include some form of party identification);
- how standards and regulations interrelate; and
- IMPC codes.

91 Since then, the SB had formed a single *ad hoc* group to review data and draft a report for the SB. The SRG had accomplished the following:

- exchanged information via teleconference and email and had met once;
- progressed in drafting a final report and had addressed more than half of the assigned topics;

92 Some remaining issues will be covered in the forthcoming days, and the SRG's goal is to produce a draft report for the October SB meeting for comment and revision.

93 The SB was invited to comment on the format and content of Annex 1, and to review and discuss recommendations in Annex 2 of Doc 6. Details of the presentation can be seen at Annex 4.

94 Regarding Part III of the proposed report format dealing with the purpose, construct and process of requesting international processing centre (IMPC) codes, feedback is expected after Congress discussion/decision of issues related to this topic.

95 As a point of general reflexion, Denmark believed that the SB needed a process for reviewing/controlling standards from time to time. Standards being used by only two countries should be assessed as to whether they were important for the postal sector as a whole or were likely to be used bilaterally only. It also stated that more countries should participate in the development of standards.

96 Answering a question from the Netherlands about how the presenter considered the recommendation to "continue to encourage the working group chairs to consider widest points of view to provide best possible drafts," the USA replied that it meant to get more input from user groups on standards. The USA agreed to reword this sentence to avoid ambiguities.

97 The Chairman of the DCG/EXG noted that the Chairman of PEG and he had met recently with representatives of user groups (Parcel, Letter Post, EMS and PTC) to encourage user involvement in proposals for new standards and in the development of standards relevant to them. He did not agree with the proposal to circulate new work items to UPU user groups for comments before the grant of Status P. He believed that submission at higher status would be more appropriate because, at Status P, the idea might not be totally defined and so it would be difficult to identify all appropriate stakeholders to participate at this stage.

98 The IB noted that the two-week time limit for circulating documents before meetings was very short. Expanding this limit to no less than 4 weeks was also not viable.

99 IPC observed that changes to status 0 or 1 standards should never be urgent. The Chairman suggested that a new proposal presented to the SB for the first time should not be to obtain status approval at that meeting. This check would allow participants to thoroughly assess proposals and give their comments. IPC also commented that the same process should be followed when submitting proposals for status 2 to the POC so as to give the latter the same period of time to evaluate and comment the proposed standard.

100 The SB strongly encouraged all SB members to send feedback on Annexes 1 and 2 of POC SB 2008.3–Doc 6 by 8 August 2008 to the USA ([clayton.bonnell@usps.gov](mailto:clayton.bonnell@usps.gov)). This would enable finalization of the draft report for the POC, and also allow the draft report to be presented to the SB for approval in October 2008. (AP 0067:All)

101 France supported the need to actively review standards every SB meeting, and to increase awareness of any standards that needed to be re-prioritised, reconfirmed, withdrawn or requiring other action.

102 To facilitate higher visibility for the user community and development participants, the SB requested the IB to add to the Standards Status List the date in which a standard status was acquired. (AP 0068:IB)

## VII. Perspectives of XML usage

103 France and IPC gave a comprehensive presentation on XML usage. This presentation was part of providing the SB with an overview of how to create XML files, the usage of XSLT, a few customs examples illustrating the need for introducing XML support to ITMATT, and how XML could be used in standardisation (data handling, communication between applications, defining path and criteria for executing searching in database, etc). This presentation was intended to help participants decide when it was better to use XML as opposed to EDIFACT. Details of this presentation can be seen at Annex 5. Further information or files related to the demo examples presented during the meeting can be obtained from [bernard.rouille@laposte.fr](mailto:bernard.rouille@laposte.fr).

## VIII. Any other business

### *a Norwegian request for an IMPC code*

104 The IB reported a request from Norway Post applying for NOOSLF as the code for an IMPC owned by it but located in Copenhagen. This Office of Exchange (OE) is not an ETOE and handles mail originating from Norway only. However, Post Denmark processes this mail under contract to Norway Post.

105 Norway Post wanted a code prefixed NO because it feared that using the prefix DK would lead other countries to mistakenly think that this IMPC was an ETOE, and this would not meet their business needs.

106 S34, which defines the structure of IMPC codes, defines the first five characters to be the UN/LOCODE. The first two characters indicated the country in which the OE is physically located and the next three characters indicated the location – in this case Copenhagen. Following these rules, the first five characters of the IMPC code should be DKCPH as opposed to NOOSL.

107 The IB believed that this was a new category of IMPC, in addition to standard IMPCs, military IMPCs, ETOEs, and private sector operator offices.

108 IPC pointed out a similar situation with a Swedish IMPC located in Copenhagen and operated by Denmark. It noted that the DCG had permitted allocation of the IMPC code SEMMA (using the UN\_LOCODE for Malmo) as Malmo was located just across the bridge in Sweden). IPC claimed that this was because S34 permitted allocation of a UN/LOCODE of a city close to the IMPC in question. This was an ambiguity that needed to be addressed by the DCG. IPC found it difficult to apply this exception to the Norway case as Oslo is not close to Copenhagen.

109 The IB believed that this interpretation of assigning a UN/LOCODE of a city close to the IMPC in question was justified only when there was no UN/LOCODE for the IMPC's actual physical location, and that the allocation of SEMMA was therefore incorrect.

110 IPC noted a need to disassociate the concept of ETOE with IMPCs physically located outside the country of origin but processing only that country's despatches. This would avoid cases like that of Norway Post, who did not want this IMPC to be confused with a Norwegian ETOE being operated in Denmark.

111 Following a lengthy discussion about identifying the IMPC operator rather than the location of the IMPC, the SB decided that this specific request from Norway Post should conform to the rules. Hence, only UN/LOCODE DKCPH could be offered for the time being for this IMPC. Meanwhile, the SRG should extend its study of S34 to find solutions to such cases.

112 The SB noted that S34 was one of the standards included in the POC Comprehensive Study on selected standards being undertaken by the SRG, and that there was also a Congress proposal to investigate the construction IMPC codes.

**IX. Date and place of the next meetings**

113 The schedule of future meetings was confirmed as follows:

- SB 2008.4 Berne, 30 October 2008
- SB 2009.1 January/February (Date and place to be determined)
- SB 2009.2 Berne (Date to be determined)
- SB 2009.3 Canada, 30 June 2009 (City to be determined)

Thomas Day

Chairman of the Standards Board

**Annexes:**

- 1 List of participants
- 2 Presentation on CEN TC 331 activities
- 3 Report from Postal Addressing Group
- 4 Report from Standards Review Group
- 5 Presentation on perspective of XML usage

**Action point list**

<b>Number</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Responsible body</b>
0032	SB 2008.1 (65) Develop a proposal requesting that POC approve M14 at status 2, and withdraw M11.	IB
0038	SB 2008.2 (8) Include a note in standard P28 for the particular definition of postal item in its context.	PEB
0041	SB 2008.2 (35) Draft a document about certification of S42 to be evaluated and commented at the next SB meeting.	ASG
0042	SB 2008.2 (53) Review the work item proposal on Geocoding in postal codes and resubmit it for status P approval to the 2008 July SB meeting.	CEN/ASG
0050	SB 2008.2 (92) Inform SB of the scope and relative importance of related patents to S43.	USA
0056	SB 2008.3 (31) Analyse CEN's questionnaire on sequencing in urban areas, and propose a way forward.	IPC
0057	SB 2008.3 (41) Request ASG to draft a document for the SB on addressing problems and other requirements about implementing S42.	ASG
0058	SB 2008.3 (51) Publish PREDES V2.1 as status 0.	PEB/IB
0059	SB 2008.3 (54) Update the <i>Catalogue of Standards</i> to reflect the withdrawal of S11, and eliminate code list 125.	PEB/IB
0060	SB 2008.3 (59) Update <i>List of Claims</i> on the UPU website to reflect USA's potential claims on P32.	IB
0061	SB 2008.3 (75) Liaise with the IB's Legal Department to identify actions that might be taken about PReM.	IB
0062	SB 2008.3 (79) Work collaboratively with IPC, France, USA and Canada to improve cover document and specification on PReM to be resubmitted to the 2008.4 SB for status 0 approval.	AESUG
0063	SB 2008.3 (87) Update the <i>General Information on UPU standards</i> to include the creation of the new permanent RFID Standards Group.	PEB/IB
0064	SB 2008.3 (87) Invite China (in its capacity as the Chairman of the AESUG RFID subgroup) to assume the vice-chairmanship of the RFID standards group and to invite AESUG participants to join it.	RFID SG Chairman
0065	SB 2008.3 (87) Refer the strategy proposed in POC SB 2008–Doc 5, paragraphs 27 and 28, and other tasks proposed by PEG in paragraph 84 of this report, to the RFID SG.	IB

0067	SB 2008.3 (100) Send feedback on Annexes 1 and 2 of POC SB 2008.3–Doc 6 by 8 August 2008 to the USA ( <a href="mailto:clayton.bonnell@usps.gov">clayton.bonnell@usps.gov</a> ).	All
0068	SB 2008.3 (102) Add the date on which a given status was acquired to the <i>Standards Status List</i> .	IB