



COMMITTEE 4 (STANDARDS AND TECHNOLOGY)

STANDARDS BOARD

DATA AND CODE DEFINITION GROUP / ELECTRONIC EXCHANGE GROUP (DCG/EXG)

Brussels, 5 March 2009

S10 Identification of postal items – 13-character ID, update proposal

Agenda item 9a

Document by the International Bureau

Subject	References/Paragraphs
Update proposal – Restructure of S10 and plan to achieve status 2	§§ 1–5
Decision expected DCG/EXG members are requested to endorse the proposed plan and to endorse a status 0 proposal to the 2009.2 Standards Board.	§§ 6-12

I. Background

1 There is extensive background to this issue. It can be seen in the following documents:

- POC SB PEG 2007.4, of 6 December 2007
- POC SB DCG/EXG 2008.3-Doc 12.Rev 1, of 11 September 2008
- POC C4 SB DCG/EXG 2008.4-Doc 9 of 4/5 December 2008

2 At the 2008.4 DCG/EXG, the restructured S10 as well as the replacement for S10a was discussed. This highlighted a number of issues still to be considered, and to move this subject forward it was agreed that DCG/EXG members would provide feedback on the documents (9 and 15), to the IB Secretariat by mid January 2009. The IB and IPC would then work collaboratively to develop a revised document to be forwarded to the DCG/EXG by end January 2009.

II. Progress since last meeting

3 In further developing this document from that submitted at the last meeting, the IB reviewed all comments received from IPC and from the working group members, incorporating many. The document was reviewed extensively by the chair of the Standards Review Group (USA). The draft was also circulated to users outside the working groups (in Australia, Poland and Hong Kong). As regards readability, it was reviewed by IB staff with experience in postal operations in their home country. It was also reviewed by the IB Directorate responsible for the UPU Acts and Regulations and for the work to be carried out under the mandate of Congress Resolution

C 63 / 2008, specifically as regards the delineation of responsibilities between UPU member countries and designated operators, the text regarding ETOEs, and regarding the integration with regulations in general. Considering the nature of this standard and its intended linkage with regulations, the draft was also reviewed by the IB editors. This helps to ensure that the final document can be easily translated and interpreted by UPU members.

- 4 Specific changes that have been incorporated since the previous meeting are:
- The bilateral agreement requirement for service indicator codes AZ, CZ, EX-EZ, LZ, VZ, and RZ, although for CZ and EX-EZ, it is not precisely as in S10b and S10d. This issue had been previously documented in POC SB DCG/EXG 2008.3-Doc 12 Rev1, §7e and in POC SB PEG 2007.4 §§20–22.
 - The text that previously required operators to discourage customers from using S10-format barcodes and to remove or obliterate such barcodes has been changed from “shall” to “should” as it is not supported by regulation.
 - The range of valid serial numbers has been changed to start at one (1) rather than zero, to be consistent with typical forms manufacturing processes.
 - The barcode height for parcels has been harmonized with that of letter post and EMS.
 - Sections of the document have been re-sequenced and a number of changes to the text have been made to enhance readability, with every effort made to use simple (and translatable) language.
- 5 Annex 1 to this document contains a draft of the restructured S10 standard. For reference and comparison, annex 2 contains the current-state standards associated with S10.

III. Decision expected

6 As the 13-character S10 standard is heavily referenced in regulations and is a basis for financial settlements between designated operators of the UPU, one business objective is to have the restructured S10 standard at status 2 (POC approved) as soon as possible.

7 It should be noted that, in current-state, there is no direct linkage between regulations and standards for the human-readable component or the barcode component. The introduction of this standard creates a direct reference.

8 Implementation requires communication and liaison between the Standards Board and groups in the Letter Post Committee (Co-chairs Great Britain and Switzerland), the Parcel Post Committee (Chair New Zealand) and the EMS Cooperative. There are no specific business process changes by UPU members to implement this revised standard. Rather, implementation would consist of aligning regulations to the revised standard, and in the process, simplifying the regulations and harmonizing text between letter post and parcel post, to the extent possible. The planned target for the regulation changes is the 2010 POC.

9 It is possible that, in the process of going from status 0 to 1 to 2, the Letter Post Committee and/or the Parcel Post Committee will request the Standard Board to do further work on this standard.

10 This submission is also relevant to the Standards Board work with the CA Interconnectivity Group on Congress resolution C 63 / 2008.

11 The proposed plan is to:

- i Submit a status 0 proposal to the 2009.2 Standards Board (late March 2009 coincidental with POC), superseding S10a, S10b, S10c, S10d, S10e, and requesting Standards Board approval to endorse making the necessary consequential changes to S45 and S46 for presentation to a subsequent DCG/EXG and Standards Board, so that S45 and S46 will not conflict be in line with the restructured S10 standard;

ii plan for a status 1 proposal to the Standards Board six months after status 0 and a status 2 proposal six months after status 1.

12 DCG/EXG members are requested to endorse a status 0 proposal for forwarding to the 2009.2 Standards Board.

Annexes

1 Restructured S10 standard

| 2 Current-state standards required to understand and implement 13-characters identifiers.