

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
POSTAL REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, DC 20268-0001

Before Commissioners:

Michael Kubayanda, Chairman;
Ann C. Fisher, Vice Chairman;
Mark Acton;
Ashley E. Poling; and
Robert G. Taub

Periodic Reporting of Service Performance

Docket No. RM2022-7

NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING TO REVISE
PERIODIC REPORTING OF SERVICE PERFORMANCE

(Issued September 21, 2022)

I. INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 503, 3652, 3653, 3692 and 3705, this Order establishes a rulemaking docket that proposes revisions to update the existing annual and periodic service performance reporting requirements for the Postal Service's Market Dominant products, which are codified in 39 CFR part 3055, subparts A and B, as well as related revisions consistent with the Postal Service Reform Act of 2022 (PSRA).¹ The proposed rules appear after the signature of this Order.

¹ See Postal Service Reform Act of 2022, H.R. 3076, 117th Cong. (2022).

II. BACKGROUND

The Postal Accountability and Enhancement Act (PAEA) granted the Commission enhanced information gathering and reporting responsibilities. See 39 U.S.C. 3652(e)(1). The PAEA provides that the Commission shall prescribe the content and form of the public reports that the Postal Service files with the Commission under section 3652. *Id.* In doing so, the Commission must attempt to provide the public with timely information that is adequate to allow it to assess the lawfulness of Postal Service rates, should attempt to avoid unnecessary or unwarranted Postal Service effort and expense, and must endeavor to protect the confidentiality of commercially sensitive information. See *id.* The Commission may initiate proceedings to improve the quality, accuracy, or completeness of Postal Service reporting whenever it determines that the service performance data have become significantly inadequate, could be significantly improved, or otherwise require revision as necessitated by the public interest. 39 U.S.C. 3652(e)(2).

Additionally, on April 6, 2022, the PSRA was signed into law. The PSRA imposed additional requirements on the Postal Service and the Commission that require consideration of changes to 39 CFR part 3055. Specifically, the PSRA directs the Postal Service to develop and maintain a publicly available online “dashboard” that provides weekly service performance data for Market Dominant products. See 39 U.S.C. 3692(c). It also mandates that the Commission provide reporting requirements for this Postal Service dashboard as well as “recommendations for any modifications to the Postal Service’s measurement systems necessary to measure and publish the performance information” located on the dashboard. 39 U.S.C. 3692(b)(2). The PSRA also authorizes the Postal Service to provide certain nonpostal services to the public and other Governmental agencies and requires the Postal Service to periodically report the quality of service for these nonpostal services. See 39 U.S.C. 3703-3705.

Considering these developments, the Commission initiated this docket in order to update the service performance reporting requirements codified in 39 CFR part 3055 and make the additions required by the PSRA. On April 26, 2022, the Commission

issued its Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking to Revise Periodic Reporting of Service Performance proposing several modifications to the reporting requirements, providing an opportunity for interested persons to comment, and appointing a Public Representative.² Six initial sets of comments and one set of reply comments were filed.³ These comments will be addressed where relevant to the issues presented below.

III. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

As explained above, the Commission initially proposed several amendments to the reporting requirements. In addition to discussing these modifications, the commenters also proposed additional changes to the regulations. The proposed amendments are discussed below and organized by topic.

A. Actual Days to Delivery

1. Background

In Order No. 6160, the Commission proposed a requirement that the Postal Service report the average actual calendar days to delivery for all Market Dominant products. Order No. 6160 at 5. The Commission explained that such “information is useful in that it is easily understood by the public and presents a picture of the actual service being provided at any given time.” *Id.* It also noted that the Postal Service already provides this information in various communications to the public. *Id.*

² Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking to Revise Periodic Reporting of Service Performance, April 26, 2022 (Order No. 6160).

³ Comments of the National Association of Presort Mailers, June 3, 2022 (NAPM Comments); Comments of the National Postal Policy Council, June 3, 2022 (NPPC Comments); Comments of Alliance of Nonprofit Mailers, June 3, 2022 (ANM Comments); Comments of the Association for Postal Commerce, June 3, 2022 (PostCom Comments); Comments of the United States Postal Service, June 3, 2022 (Postal Service Comments); Public Representative Comments, June 3, 2022 (PR Comments); Reply Comments of the United States Postal Service, June 24, 2022 (Reply Comments); see *also* Notice of Errata to Reply Comments of the United States Postal Service, July 1, 2022.

2. Comments

The National Association of Presort Mailers (NAPM) generally supports the reporting of actual days to delivery if the reporting is done separately for each individual product. It states that data aggregation across products may be misleading to some users of the mail. NAPM Comments at 3. NAPM asserts that the Postal Service should report the data for each Market Dominant product on a monthly basis. *Id.* at 4. In reply, the Postal Service questions the value of the suggested modifications, contending that the modifications suggested by NAPM do not provide additional value beyond what is already being reported. Reply Comments at 3-4.

The Association for Postal Commerce (PostCom) also supports this proposal, noting that average days to delivery is more useful than the percentage of on-time pieces and enables better comparability. PostCom Comments at 1. PostCom states that the Postal Service should also be required to report on dispersion/variance around the average. *Id.* at 2. In its response, the Postal Service asserts that this recommendation is excessively burdensome and would “risk obscuring more than [it] illuminate[s].” Reply Comments at 3.

The National Postal Policy Council (NPPC) supports the proposal to report average calendar days for delivery and asserts that the proposed metrics are more useful to mailers than the current service performance reports that present only the percentages of mail that meet their respective standards. NPPC Comments at 2. Similar to PostCom, NPPC contends that the reports on actual days of delivery include data describing the “tail of the mail” (variance data). *Id.*

The Public Representative does not support reporting the average actual calendar days to delivery for an aggregated group of Market Dominant products. PR Comments at 4. Although he agrees that such information is easily understood by the public, he notes that its various members may interpret this statistic differently, depending upon their familiarity with the applied measurement methods. *Id.* The Public Representative also notes that “composite scores may be misleading” to some mailers because of data averaging, which “smooths out the highs and lows of various product

delivery times,” yielding the average that will remain relatively stable while individual product delivery times might vary. *Id.* at 4-5.

In its comments, the Postal Service urges a clarification regarding the definition of “average actual calendar days” and how that metric differs from “delivery days,” which are days on which Market Dominant products are eligible for delivery, excluding Sundays and holidays. Postal Service Comments at 5. The Postal Service asserts that delivery days are a more appropriate measure because the use of all calendar days would artificially inflate average delivery times. *Id.*

3. Commission Analysis

In response to the commenters’ suggestions and analysis, the Commission proposes the following requirements with regards to average actual days to delivery. First, the Postal Service must report average actual “delivery days”—*i.e.*, days in which Market Dominant products are eligible for delivery—for each Market Dominant product, as NAPM suggested. The Public Representative and NAPM expressed concerns that data aggregation across products and averaging may be misleading because such averaging smooths out highs and lows of various products delivery times, and the aggregate measure would remain relatively stable unless significant changes occur in the delivery days of several products. See NAPM Comments at 3; PR Comments at 4. The Commission finds the metric of average actual delivery days an easier metric to understand for some mailers relative to the percentage of on-time delivery metric. The Commission is also mindful of the potential impacts of data aggregation. Reporting by product should alleviate some of these impacts. The Commission also accepts the Postal Service’s suggestion that delivery days is more appropriate than calendar days for reporting purposes.

Second, the Postal Service must report the following information on dispersion around the average: percent delivered within +1 day of service standard, percent delivered within +2 days of service standard, and percent delivered within +3 days of

service standard. These data are valuable in evaluating the severity of service performance failures relative to the applicable service standard.

Third, the Postal Service must report these data for each Market Dominant product at the current District, Postal Administrative Area (Area), and National levels. These data must be reported quarterly in the Service Performance Measurement (SPM) reports and annually in the Annual Compliance Review (ACR) reports, detailing data from the previous quarter and previous fiscal year, respectively. This frequency and geographic disaggregation should be sufficient for the Commission to track the average actual delivery days of Market Dominant products over time and at various geographic levels.

B. Point Impact Data

1. Background

Next, the Commission proposed that the Postal Service report root cause point impact data for all Market Dominant products. Order No. 6160 at 5. The term “point impact” refers to the number of percentage points by which on-time performance decreased due to a specific root cause of failure. The Commission explained that “[t]hese data are useful in isolating significant drivers of delay for an individual product and have been previously provided by the Postal Service as part of the Annual Compliance Review proceedings.” *Id.* (citation omitted).

2. Comments

The Public Representative supports the reporting of point impact data, noting that it is useful in isolating significant drivers of service delays and states that, given their provision during the ACR process, this information would not create an undue burden on the Postal Service. PR Comments at 8. The Public Representative also states that this data should be reported at least quarterly and annually, by legacy geographic levels, so that the data could demonstrate valuable seasonal changes. *Id.*

In its comments, the Postal Service acknowledges the potential value of root cause impact data and how they may impact delays. Postal Service Comments at 6. The Postal Services asserts, however, that it already utilizes data describing the root causes of failure and that providing data for each Market Dominant product would be excessively burdensome and of limited value. *Id.* at 6-7. Specifically, the Postal Service asserts that providing such information would require eight additional employees and would cost approximately \$1 million to set up and impose annual costs of \$130,000. *Id.* at 7-8. Therefore, it requests that the Commission reconsider this proposal, and barring that, requests that any reporting requirements use the Postal Service's current organizational structure. *Id.* at 8.

PostCom and NAPM also commented on the reporting burden that would be borne by the Postal Service should the Commission institute the proposed root cause reporting requirements. PostCom asserts that the Commission should strongly consider whether the utility of the data is worth the cost to the Postal Service. PostCom Comments at 3. It contends further that the Commission should not require data collection and reporting unless it is useful in decreasing costs and rates for mailers. *Id.* at 2-3. NAPM agrees and notes that the data collection and reporting requirements should "balance the needs of mail users, the USPS, and the Commission, with the USPS' costs of compliance, which ultimately can drive up mail prices." NAPM Comments at 2. NAPM also recommends that the Commission consider limiting the reporting of root cause point impact data to only the top root causes and require less reporting when a product is achieving its service performance goals. *Id.* at 4. In addition, it notes that, from its review of the FY 2021 ACR, there are "Unassigned" root causes of failures for some products that need to be examined in more detail. *Id.*

3. Commission Analysis

With the commenters' statements in mind, the Commission proposes that the Postal Service report point impact data for the top 10 root causes of on-time performance failures for each Market Dominant product (except those included in

Special Services) that did not meet its service performance goal pursuant to 39 CFR 3055.2(d).

Balancing the utility of the data with the burden to the Postal Service, the Commission notes that point impact data is useful for isolating significant drivers of delay for products that do not meet their service performance goals while avoiding the additional costs of reporting on products that do. The Postal Service already reports in the ACR the top five root causes of failure for each Market Dominant product that did not meet its service performance targets in the prior fiscal year, which indicates that the data reporting architecture for this information is already in place. Requiring the reporting of the top 10 root causes of failure for each product that does not meet its service performance targets will allow appropriate analysis of the root causes of failure over time. Analyzing trends in root causes of failure in turn will identify areas of focus for improving service performance.

For First-Class Mail products that do not meet their service performance goals, the Postal Service must report the top 10 root causes of failure at both the Area level and National level. For the remaining Market Dominant products that do not meet service performance targets, the Postal Service must report the top 10 root causes of failure at the National level. The Postal Service must report the top root causes for the previous fiscal year annually in the ACR. This frequency should be sufficient to analyze the top 10 root causes of failure for each non-compliant Market Dominant product on a yearly basis.

In addition, the Postal Service should seek to minimize the use of the “Unable to Assign” root cause failure category when providing root causes of failure for different products. The Commission understands that it might not be possible to eliminate such a category due to the possibility of certain ambiguous service performance failures. However, because the “Unable to Assign” category indicates either a data reporting problem or many instances of multiple causes of failure, the Postal Service should strive to minimize the use of this category as much as possible.

C. 24-Hour Clock and Site-Specific Operating Plan Data

1. Background

Initially, the Commission intended to require the Postal Service to report the performance for each national operating plan target (also referred to as the 24-Hour Clock national clearance goals) for all Market Dominant products. Order No. 6160 at 5. The Commission explained that these “data are useful in isolating bottlenecks in processing that are causing the most significant negative service impacts on each product and have been previously provided by the Postal Service as part of the Annual Compliance Review proceedings.” *Id.* at 5-6 (footnote omitted).

2. Comments

Several commenters support this proposal. NAPM explains that it favors reporting 24-Hour Clock national clearance goals performance, noting that it supports increased data transparency. NAPM Comments at 5. Similarly, the Public Representative supports this reporting requirement as proposed, noting that this information is necessary and relevant to the ACR process, and he specifies that these data should be provided at the most disaggregated level possible to be useful to the public and mailers. PR Comments at 13. PostCom also supports this requirement but urges the Commission to consider the granularity of the reported data. PostCom Comments at 3-4. It asserts that because of the large number of facilities, aggregating such reporting data at the national level will yield an average of questionable value that is heavily influenced by the largest locations. *Id.* at 3. It further suggests that the Commission consider requesting facility-level reporting for the 24-Hour Clock processing metrics. *Id.* The Postal Service replies that facility-level data are commercially sensitive and should not be disclosed to the public. Reply Comments at 6.

For its part, the Postal Service notes that 24-Hour Clock clearance goal data are currently collected by shape, direction (*i.e.*, incoming or outgoing) and certain sortation

levels rather than by product, and thus requests that any reporting requirements use the Postal Service's current organizational structure and be reported quarterly and annually in the ACR. Postal Service Comments at 9.

3. Commission Analysis

The Commission has considered the Postal Service's comments and proposes to require the reporting of Site-Specific Operating Plans (SSOPs) instead of the performance of 24-Hour Clock targets it initially proposed. The Postal Service reports that it no longer uses the National Operating Plan (24-Hour Clock) and instead uses the new SSOPs.⁴ While these new data do not specifically address the performance of the entire postal network, they do provide performance data (*i.e.*, percent on-time performance for each SSOP measurement category, such as "Flat Sequencing System"), subdivided into Regions and Divisions as well as at the National total. The Postal Service must report these data by Region and Division, as identified in the SSOPs, and at the National level. These data must be reported quarterly as an attachment to the SPM reports and annually in the ACR. This frequency and geographic disaggregation should be sufficient to analyze the performance of SSOPs over time and by geographic segment.

D. Nonpostal Products

1. Background

As explained above, the PSRA requires the Postal Service to submit to the Commission, no later than 90 days after the end of each fiscal year, a report that analyzes, among other things, the "quality of service for each agreement or substantially similar set of agreements for the provision of property or nonpostal services" under

⁴ See Docket No. ACR2021, Motion of the United States Postal Service Requesting Clarification of Certain ACD Directives, June 14, 2022, at 4-6.

methodologies prescribed by the Commission. 39 U.S.C. 3705(a)(1). By regulation, the Commission must prescribe the content and form of this report, giving due consideration to: (a) providing the public with timely, adequate information; (b) avoiding unnecessary burden to the Postal Service; and (c) protecting confidentially sensitive commercial information. 39 U.S.C. 3705(b)(1). As such, in Order No. 6160, the Commission expressed its intention to create reporting requirements for the quality of service for all of the Postal Service's nonpostal products and sought public comment on how best to effectuate these requirements by regulation. Order No. 6160 at 6.

2. Comments

The Public Representative provides compliance suggestions regarding this reporting requirement. Specifically, the Public Representative suggests the Commission insert into the regulatory section reserved for nonpostal service products (§ 3055.25) the same language that is in comparable rules for annually reporting service performance for the other Market Dominant classes, specifically “[f]or each product within the [nonpostal services] class, report the on-time service performance (as a percentage rounded to one decimal place).” PR Comments at 16 (internal quotation marks omitted). He asserts that this language would be sufficient to comply with the PSRA requirement regarding reporting of Market Dominant nonpostal service performance. *Id.* Additionally, the Public Representative acknowledges that “[s]ervice performance for competitive nonpostal services is not reported in the Annual Compliance Report” and thus new rules are needed. *Id.* He suggests revising the language of the regulations to include the phrase “and for each competitive nonpostal service product specified in the Mail Classification Schedule in part 3040, appendix B to subpart A of part 3040” to include these competitive products. *Id.*

PostCom again makes note of the relative burden of resources committed to reporting and asserts that “until and unless the number and size of the Postal Service's nonpostal products increases substantially, the Commission should seek to minimize the resources committed to this effort.” PostCom Comments at 4.

NAPM states that it cannot make specific recommendations without the term “nonpostal product” being defined and thus recommends “that as these new nonpostal products are subsequently defined, opportunity be given for comment on appropriate reporting requirements to ensure quality of service.” NAPM Comments at 5.

The Postal Service limits its comments to Market Dominant products only, noting that it believes that the Commission restricted the scope of the proceedings to such products. Postal Service Comments at 10. The only two Market Dominant nonpostal services, it continues, are: “(1) alliances or agreements with the private sector entities for the provision of a core postal function or the funding of the function; and (2) philatelic sales.” *Id.* at 11 (footnote omitted). Moreover, philatelic sales are already included in service performance reporting via the Stamp Fulfillment Services product and, according to the Postal Service, private-sector alliances or agreements “are not amenable to meaningful quality-of-service measurement, and, accordingly, there is no basis to establish reporting rules for that service.” *Id.* The Postal Service also asserts that Congress has not imposed separate service performance reporting requirements on nonpostal products, but rather simply requires “a report that analyzes...quality of service” for said products, and thus a separate reporting requirement for competitive products should not be imposed. *Id.* at 11-13 (emphasis omitted).

3. Commission Analysis

As discussed above, the PSRA requires the Postal Service to file an annual report analyzing the “quality of service” for nonpostal services under methodologies prescribed by the Commission, making no distinction between Market Dominant and competitive products. See 39 U.S.C. 3705(a)(1). In addition, the Commission did not intend for Order No. 6160 to limit discussion solely to Market Dominant products. As such, the Commission proposes reporting requirements for nonpostal services products that align with the recommendations of the Public Representative. The Commission proposes that Postal Service report performance of each nonpostal product in the ACR, disaggregated by District and Area as well as for the Nation on an annual and quarterly

basis. This frequency and geographic disaggregation should be sufficient to evaluate the service performance of nonpostal products over time and by geographic segment. The Commission encourages the Postal Service to develop appropriate target metrics and target values for each nonpostal product. The Commission acknowledges that the Postal Service has stated that it plans to request a semi-permanent exception to exclude nonpostal services from reporting, pursuant to existing 39 CFR 3005.3.⁵

E. Mail Excluded from Measurement

1. Background

In Docket No. PI2016-1, the Commission invited public comment on issues related to the quality and completeness of service performance data measured by the Postal Service.⁶ In response, several commenters expressed concerns about the quantity and impact of mail excluded from Postal Service measurement. *See, e.g.*, Order No. 3490 at 15-19. As a result, the Commission required the Postal Service to regularly report certain exclusion information, finding that this information would “enhance the quality and completeness of service performance data.” *Id.* at 24. In Order No. 6160, the Commission explained that it is now considering whether to require the Postal Service to regularly report this information—specifically: (a) mail excluded from measurement, disaggregated by reason(s) for exclusion; and (b) mail volumes measured and unmeasured by Full Service Intelligent Mail barcode (IMb). Order No. 6160 at 6.

⁵ Postal Service Comments at 14 n.29. The Commission is not prejudging the success or failure of making any of these arguments in obtaining an exception.

⁶ Docket No. PI2016-1, Order Enhancing Service Performance Requirements and Closing Docket, August 26, 2016, at 1 (Order No. 3490).

2. Comments

The Postal Service, for its part, states that it reports quarterly on mail in measurement, volume excluded from measurement, and percentage of volume by reason for exclusion, and it believes that such reporting is sufficient. Postal Service Comments at 14-15. It asserts that its current reporting “affords a transparent view into how much mail is in measurement” and “provides ample clarity into the quantity and impact of” excluded mail. *Id.* at 15. According to the Postal Service, “[t]here is no reason to think that modifications requiring extra reporting would prove in any way useful.” *Id.*

Other commenters specifically addressed the two different proposed reports, discussed below.

a. Mail Excluded from Measurement, by Exclusion Reason

Several commenters support the codification of the requirement that the Postal Service report on mail excluded from measurement. Both PostCom and NPPC generally support the proposal to require regular reporting of volumes excluded from measurement. PostCom Comments at 4; NPPC Comments at 2-3. NAPM states that it needs access to data at a level sufficient for a preparer to determine why a piece is being excluded from measurement and to consequently allow the preparer to make improvements. NAPM Comments at 6. In reply, the Postal Service notes that it “already provides an external dashboard through the Business Customer Gateway,” which it contends provides more valuable information. Reply Comments at 5.

The Public Representative also supports this requirement and suggests that in this report on mail excluded from measurement, the Postal Service additionally provide explanations for “Unable to Collect” notations, pointing out that such reasons may implicate the content of the reporting rules. PR Comments at 19-20. For its part, NAPM recommends “further disaggregation of data in the report” rather than showing exclusion reason as a percent of total exclusions. NAPM Comments at 7. It explains that this

would allow for better analysis of trends in improvement and declines for each exclusion reason. *Id.* at 6-7.

b. Mail Volumes Measured and Unmeasured by IMb

“For the Measured/Unmeasured Volume report, [NAPM] recommend[s] adding a few columns to show percentages for each product category where data is being presented, such as the percent of pieces not in measurement compared to total pieces; the percent of Full-Service IMb pieces excluded from measurement compared to total IMb Full-Service pieces, etc.,” as well as comparisons of the information between multiple quarters and years. NAPM Comments at 6. The Postal Service replies that it “already provides the percent of pieces not in measurement compared to total pieces; it also provides the percent of Full-Service IMb pieces excluded from measurement compared to total IMb Full-Service pieces.” Reply Comments at 5 (footnote omitted).

Both PostCom and NPPC generally support the reporting requirements related to mail volumes measured and unmeasured by IMb. PostCom Comments at 4-5; NPPC Comments at 2-3. PostCom also encourages reporting for mail measured by IMb to be augmented by reporting average days to delivery for excluded pieces, reasoning that many excluded mailpieces produce scan events that enable measurement of this information. PostCom Comments at 4-5.

The Public Representative also supports the reporting of mail volumes measured and unmeasured by IMb, explaining that such information should be reported because of the concerning downward pattern in IMb mail measured. PR Comments at 22-23.

3. Commission Analysis

After reviewing the comments, the Commission supports the implementation of the reporting requirements related to mail volumes excluded from measurement.

With respect to reporting such mail volumes disaggregated by reason for exclusion, the Commission proposes that the current quarterly report (filed as a spreadsheet attachment to the Postal Service’s quarterly reports on service

performance) be modified to include the number of mailpieces excluded from measurement for each exclusion category as well as the percentage of the total exclusions represented by that exclusion category. This additional reporting is warranted because the percentage calculations alone without the supporting volume data do not allow for the evaluation of performance trends over time because as one exclusion reason decreases, other exclusion reasons will increase in percentage even if the number of mailpieces excluded remains unchanged because they now represent a larger percent of total exclusions. The Postal Service must report these data both on a quarterly basis on the same schedule as its Quarterly Reports pursuant to 39 CFR part 3055, subpart B (in other words, 40 days after the close of the quarter) and annually in the ACR. These reports should include data from the previous quarter and fiscal year, respectively. This frequency of reporting should be sufficient to track the volumes included in and excluded from measurement over time. This formally codifies the existing obligation under Order No. 3490 and amplifies the usefulness of the data reported without adding significant burden.

Regarding the report on mail volume measured and unmeasured by IMb, for each field in the current form (filed as a spreadsheet attachment to the Postal Service's quarterly reports on service performance), the Postal Service should also present the same data point from the same period in the previous year. In addition, the Postal Service should present for each product category: (1) the percentage of mailpieces in measurement compared to total mailpieces; (2) the percentage of mailpieces not in measurement compared to total mailpieces; (3) the percentage of Full-Service IMb mailpieces in measurement compared to total IMb Full-Service mailpieces; and (4) the percentage of Full-Service IMb mailpieces not in measurement compared to total IMb Full-Service mailpieces. These additional data points will be valuable for mailers and the Commission to evaluate measured and unmeasured mail volumes over time. In addition, in the report, the Postal Service should include explanations for "Unable to Collect" notations as suggested by the Public Representative. These data will be valuable for the Commission in understanding why the Postal Service was unable to

collect data. The Commission believes that these additional calculations and formatting changes should not prove a significant burden to the Postal Service. The Postal Service should report these data on a quarterly basis, 60 days after the close of each quarter, and annually in the ACR. This frequency of reporting should be sufficient for the Commission to track the mail volumes included in and excluded from measurement over time.

The Commission also proposes codifying the existing requirement of Order No. 3490 that “[t]he Postal Service shall provide descriptions of the current methodologies used to verify the accuracy, reliability, and representativeness of service performance data for each service performance measurement system 90 days after the close of each fiscal year.” See Order No. 3490 at 41.

F. Postal Service Online Dashboard

1. Background

As explained above, the PSRA requires that the Postal Service develop an online dashboard “that provides performance information for market-dominant products that is updated on a weekly basis.” 39 U.S.C. 3692(c)(1). In regards to this Postal Service dashboard, the Commission shall provide “requirements for the Postal Service to publish nationwide, regional, and local delivery area performance information” that are consistent with the organizational structure of the Postal Service, “reflect the most granular geographic level of performance information appropriate for the Postal Service to publish,” and include “performance information for different time periods, including annual, quarterly, monthly, and weekly segments.” 39 U.S.C. 3692(b)(1), 3692(b)(1)(B), 3692(c)(2)(C). The Commission shall also provide “recommendations for any modifications to the Postal Service’s measurement systems necessary to measure and publish the performance information” for the Postal Service’s dashboard. 39 U.S.C. 3692(b)(2). In Order No. 6160, the Commission sought comment on how best to implement these requirements. Order No. 6160 at 7-8.

2. Comments

In its comments, the Postal Service describes what it intends to include in its online dashboard. Specifically, it notes that it will include service performance scores and service standards for First-Class Mail, USPS Marketing Mail, Periodicals, and Package Services. Postal Service Comments at 4. The dashboard will provide information at the Area and District levels and will be updated regularly. *Id.* It also states that the dashboard will have a ZIP Code look-up feature. *Id.* The Postal Service asserts that its proposed dashboard will be relevant, transparent, informative, and user-friendly. *Id.* Because it will provide information based on its delivery structure, the Postal Service contends that the dashboard will present service performance data that are actionable and promote accountability. *Id.* As the entity responsible for the dashboard, the Postal Service asserts that its judgment regarding what should be included therein merits deference. Reply Comments at 9.

The Public Representative generally suggests that the Postal Service seek public input as to the contents of the dashboard. PR Comments at 23. He explains that designing a successful dashboard requires a trade-off between a high volume of data and the accessibility and understandability of said data. *Id.* at 24. The information must be both easily locatable and easy to use. *Id.* He also asserts that the database should include explanations on how to interpret the data and should generally help users understand why their service performance experience may differ from service performance results. *Id.* at 26.

Specifically, the Public Representative recommends “that the specific District-level 95 percent confidence interval for the service performance results be linked to the service performance results presented in the PSRA dashboard.” *Id.* at 24 (footnote omitted). He also recommends that any deviations from service performance standards for a given ZIP Code pair search should be clearly explained on the dashboard, and possibly also include performance for the prior week and year. *Id.* at 24-25. He also encourages explanatory information about how a user should utilize the dashboard as well as how given ZIP Codes are grouped to Area and District levels. *Id.* at 26.

Generally, he believes that the dashboard must “include a simple way for users to identify expected days to delivery given where the mail originates and destines.” *Id.* at 27. It should also include IMb data. *Id.* at 27-28.

NPPC states that, for the dashboard to be useful, it must be both broad and granular. NPPC Comments at 4. It recommends that the dashboard provide different types of real-time (or close-to-real-time) data: nationwide performance data by class and product; “service data by time period;” performance data from/to particular originating/destinating ZIP Codes, as well as service performance data for a selected ZIP Code pair; percentage of mail that is measured for a particular query; and remittance mail by ZIP Code. *Id.* at 4-5. NPPC also recommends that mailers have an ability to filter service performance data by mail shape, service standard, and identification number. *Id.* In addition, it suggests that all data should be exportable in comma-separated or Excel format. *Id.* at 5. It also asserts that this data will improve transparency and help improve service problems along with promoting accountability and public confidence. *Id.* The Postal Service, in its reply, states that NPPC’s suggestions are burdensome and will not be useful. Reply Comments at 9.

NAPM, on the other hand, recommends that there be one centralized dashboard among USPS, USPS OIG, and the Commission, reasoning that this would be a better use of postal resources. NAPM Comments at 7-8. NAPM recommends that this dashboard should show current or recent rather than historical quarterly data, in order to better “identify and resolve service issues” and inform mail decisions. *Id.* at 8-9. It also suggests that focus groups and technical committee meetings should be used to solicit comments on database requirements. *Id.* at 9.

In a separate section of its comments, NAPM proposes separate reporting of election mail and related Postal Service costs. *Id.* at 10. This would include separate service standards for election mail. *Id.* NAPM states that this suggestion would lead to better understanding of measures the Postal Service is taking to deliver election mail, the resulting costs, and the impact on other mail. *Id.*

Similarly, NPPC proposes that the Postal Service report on Reply Mail separately within the First-Class Single-Piece Mail category. NPPC Comments at 3. NPPC states that the Postal Service noted in Docket No. PI2022-3 that it can now measure Reply Mail and that this is desirable as a first step towards reporting remittance mail. *Id.*

Additionally, the Alliance of Nonprofit Mailers (ANM) recommends that reporting for USPS Marketing Mail, Periodicals, and First-Class Mail (including root cause point impact data) should be done separately for nonprofit and commercial mail (including further disaggregation between regular nonprofit, political, and balloting-use mail). ANM Comments at 2-5. ANM states that, for USPS Marketing Mail, disaggregation of nonprofit mail for reporting purposes would enhance the transparency and usability of service performance data, particularly for nonprofit mailers. ANM Comments at 2. ANM asserts that this is important considering the large and increasing volume of nonprofit mail and the importance of the mail system to nonprofits. *Id.* at 2-4. Within nonprofit USPS Marketing Mail, it also suggests disaggregating political mail and ballots because they serve different purposes and tend to fluctuate in volume. *Id.* at 3. It also notes that breaking out nonprofit mail within USPS Marketing Mail (and political and balloting mail separately) will not be onerous or entail costly new data collection. *Id.* at 3.

3. Commission Analysis

The Commission proposes the development of an online dashboard that provides service performance data for each Market Dominant product to be updated on a weekly basis. The Commission proposes requiring the Postal Service to present service performance results for each ZIP Code, District, and Area, as well as at the National level. The dashboard should include a 5-Digit ZIP Code lookup feature that allows the user to see the service performance results for their ZIP Code and match their ZIP Codes with the corresponding District and Area. Specifically, ZIP Code information is relevant, helpful to users, and consistent with the PSRA. Moreover, the Postal Service, while claiming such ZIP Code level information would be burdensome, has not quantified the associated cost or burden as instructed by Order No. 6160.

These data must be updated weekly, no later than 1 month from the date of data collection.⁷ The query results and the data underlying the query results should be exportable in a machine-readable format, including but not limited to a comma-separated data file, an Excel spreadsheet, XML, or a JSON file, and such data should be made accessible to any person or entity utilizing tools and methods designed to facilitate access to and extraction of data in bulk, such as an Application Programming Interface (API). When there is a negative deviation from service performance standards, the dashboard should clearly indicate such deviation from expected performance and present the service performance from the prior week and prior year.

With respect to the specific service performance information available on the dashboard, it must provide the following data (at a minimum): (1) service performance (measured as a percent on-time delivery and average delivery days) by each Market Dominant mail class, product, and applicable service standard by District, Area, Nation, and 5-Digit ZIP Code; (2) service performance (measured as a percent on-time delivery and average delivery days) by Market Dominant mail class, product, and applicable service standard, by time period of the user's selection, along with the previous two fiscal years; and (3) service performance (measured as a percent on-time delivery and average delivery days) by Market Dominant mail class, product, and applicable service standard based on a selected pair of origin/destination 3-Digit or 5-Digit ZIP Code that a user would choose. These data will be useful for analyzing geographic-specific service performance data. The dashboard should improve transparency, promote accountability, provide actionable data, and thus lead to improved service performance. The ability to export the data in a machine-readable format will be useful for sophisticated mailers who seek to perform independent analyses by product or geographic location.

⁷ For example, for weekly service performance data describing the week of May 1, 2023 through May 5, 2023, the dashboard should be updated *before* Monday, June 5, 2023.

With respect to political and election mail, the Commission proposes that these mailpieces be measured and reported on the proposed service performance dashboard. The Postal Service has historically reported political and election mail, which indicates that the data reporting architecture for this information is already in place.⁸ This will allow the Commission and the general public to better understand the performance of political mail and election mail. The Commission does not support the use of separate service standards for reporting purposes because political mail and election mail are not discrete products, and the Postal Service has not assigned separate service standards for political mail and election mail.

With respect to Reply Mail, the Commission supports the measurement of this mail. These data should be reported on the proposed service performance dashboard. The near real-time frequency of data updates and by geographic segment (District, Area, and Nation) will be helpful for the Commission and mailers to track the service performance of Reply Mail over time and at various geographic levels.

With respect to nonprofit mail, the Commission supports ANM's recommendations insofar as the Commission proposes that USPS Marketing Mail mailpieces that qualify for reduced rates pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 3626(a)(6) and the regulations promulgated thereunder and Periodicals mailpieces that qualify for reduced rates pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 3626(a)(4) and the regulations promulgated thereunder be separately reported on the proposed service performance dashboard. The Commission finds that such information will be useful for nonprofit mailers and should not be unduly burdensome for the Postal Service to report. This information will be particularly useful for nonprofit mailers that qualify for preferential rate treatment in improving the transparency and usability of service performance data due to their reliance on this category of mail for their nonprofit activities.

⁸ See, e.g., Docket No. ACR2021, Responses of the United States Postal Service to Question 1-29 of Chairman's Information Request No. 1, January 18, 2022, question 21.

In general, the Commission encourages the Postal Service to reference the free and publicly available technical guides made available by the 18F office and the general website standards of the Technology Transformation Services of the General Services Administration in designing the user interface of the dashboard.⁹ The Commission expects that the Postal Service will keep the Commission informed of its progress on a monthly basis (at a minimum) in developing a site that offers a high-quality user experience, consistent with the information, comprehensibility, address search functionality, format, public input, and availability requirements of 39 U.S.C. 3692(c)(2-5), (7), (9) as well as regular consultations on appropriate features and information required pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 3692(c)(6).

G. Other Issues

1. Parallel Reporting of Legacy Information

The Postal Service asserts that generally, service performance data should only be required to be reported by its current geographic divisions (Area and District). Postal Service Comments at 16-17. It states that reporting by legacy structure “would create a significant additional data collection and reporting burden, and divert limited agency resources away from improving service performance based on the Postal Service’s existing lines of responsibility.” *Id.* (footnote omitted). The Public Representative, on the other hand, states that, at least for point impact and 24-Hour clock data, legacy geographic divisions should be used. PR Comments at 8, 13. He asserts that legacy data is useful in that it can demonstrate changes over time. *Id.* at 8.

Relatedly, NAPM suggests that when USPS changes its service standards, it should be required to report performance under both the legacy and new standards for at least one year. NAPM Comments at 10. NAPM states that this dual reporting

⁹ See General Services Administration: Technology Transformation Services: 18F, Guides, available at <https://18f.gsa.gov/guides/>; *Design principles*, U.S. Web Design Systems, <https://designsystem.digital.gov/design-principles/>.

approach would allow for comparability over time, which is critical to evaluating the impact of network changes. *Id.*

Presently, the Postal Service continues to report using the legacy geographic structure in accordance with the existing rules.¹⁰ The Commission proposes that the Postal Service be required to report service performance data using only its current Area and District geographic structure, beginning with its FY 2023 reporting. The Commission finds that evaluation of service performance results from the current reporting structure will lead to a more accurate assessment of how its current operations impact service performance. The Commission does not support a requirement of parallel reporting as a matter of rule, but will request supplemental information through information requests where appropriate. Regular parallel reporting using the legacy and current geographical structures is of limited usefulness due to the inability to compare results and to assess current operations using legacy data structures. To require the Postal Service to continue reporting service performance data using the legacy structure would be unduly burdensome.

For similar reasons, the Commission does not support NAPM's recommendation to report performance under both the legacy and new standards for at least 1 year as part of its regular service performance reporting requirements. However, though such information regarding legacy service standards is not required for compliance purposes, the Commission will request data and information through information requests where appropriate.

2. Scanning Rates

NAPM suggests that the Postal Service be required to report the scanning rates and metrics at induction, manual operations, and delivery units. NAPM Comments at 10. NAPM states that this requirement would improve visibility regarding scanning

¹⁰ United States Postal Service *Quarterly Service Performance Reports*, First-Class Mail, USPS Marketing Mail (formerly known as Standard Mail), Periodicals, and Package Service Scores Reports, available at <https://www.prc.gov/dockets/quarterly-performance>.

performance, which, in turn, can impact scanning performance. *Id.* Thus, it contends, this requirement improves service performance measurement generally. *Id.* However, the Commission does not support this recommendation because the Commission does not analyze this data on a consistent basis and therefore its utility would not outweigh the incremental reporting burden to the Postal Service.

3. Informed Visibility

NAPM suggests that USPS provide all service performance data through Informed Visibility. *Id.* NAPM states that Informed Visibility is essential to proper investigation and discussion between the Postal Service and the postal industry. *Id.* PostCom supports this requirement, stating that this would allow interested parties to independently analyze data and thus, improve service performance reporting. PostCom Comments at 5.

The Postal Service, on the other hand, asserts that requiring the reporting of unfiltered data would be unduly burdensome for the Postal Service to implement because it would require the development of additional reporting processes and the use of “additional time and effort to consistently measure and verify” this additional data. Reply Comments at 10. It also notes that reporting data in Informed Visibility form or as “unfiltered data” would come with additional costs that will not be recoverable by users. *Id.* It states that it will take the request for Informed Visibility data into consideration and will evaluate whether “customers of such data” should be subject to classifications and fees. *Id.*

The Commission will not require the mandatory reporting of Informed Visibility data. However, the Commission encourages the Postal Service to develop a method to share service performance data through Informed Visibility or in another matter that would provide mailers and service providers the ability to analyze the raw, unfiltered data.

4. Service Type Identifiers

PostCom suggests the disaggregation of product level service performance data using Service Type Identifiers (STID). PostCom Comments at 5. It states that existing product definitions are broad and show an imperfect representation to customers. *Id.* It contends that STID data, on the other hand, are more granular and thus more transparent. *Id.* The Postal Service opposes reporting using STIDs, asserting that it “would be overly burdensome and would not confer any added benefits.” Reply Comments at 9. The Commission does not intend to pursue PostCom’s recommendation as it is not specifically relevant to the evaluation of compliance regarding service performance.

5. Enforcement Issues

PostCom also urges the Commission to consider “regulatory changes that would create consequences for service failure, for example by requiring automatic refunds or by incremental reduction in rate authority.” PostCom Comments at 6. It states that “there is no substitute for accountability” and that without a mechanism to enforce accountability, increased reporting may not remedy poor service performance. *Id.*

In reply, the Postal Service “strenuously disagrees with the premise that its reporting obligations are linked to and should be incentivized by reductions to costs and rates.” Reply Comments at 11. It notes that “[r]eporting obligations should not be intended for ‘enforcement’ purposes” and asserts that such reporting “would conflict with the main intentions of the regulatory scheme authorized by Congress.” *Id.*

The Commission does not intend to investigate or implement PostCom’s suggestion to tie service standards to stronger enforcement methods at this time. The Commission reiterates that the purpose of this docket is solely to update the service performance reporting requirement regulations, and PostCom’s suggestion exceeds this stated scope.

6. Offshore Study

The Postal Service suggests the removal of the requirement to perform a special study of offshore performance every 2 years, currently codified in 39 CFR 3055.7. Postal Service Comments at 17. It asserts that the existing requirement is unnecessary considering that its current service performance measurement system measures all Districts, including offshore locations. *Id.* The Commission concurs and proposes to remove the special study requirement as it is now unnecessary.

7. Audit Reports

In terms of the Postal Service's service performance measurement system audit reports, the Public Representative recommends that the Postal Service be required to identify, at the weekly and quarterly level, those Districts failing to meet current audit criteria and identify the specific audit criteria each District fails to meet. PR Comments at 20. He also recommends that, where the Postal Service uses proxy measures, it should be required to report where and why the proxy was used. *Id.* at 21. He also recommends that the Commission obtain more information about the "Mail Processing Duration" component but does not propose a related reporting requirement. *Id.* The Public Representative states that this audit report information would allow the Commission to make more informed recommendations on the changes needed to the current service performance measurement system. *See id.* at 20.

As an initial matter, the Commission does not support requiring this additional information from the Postal Service. The service performance data and specific audit criteria discussed by the Public Representative are already being provided in quarterly audit reports on the service performance measurement system.

However, the Commission proposes to formally codify requirements that will ensure the continuation of the existing auditing program¹¹ and to consolidate the existing requirements (which are dispersed in multiple orders).¹² Therefore, consistent with the existing auditing program, the Commission proposes to require that: (1) the Postal Service shall continue with its program to provide third-party audits of its service performance measurement systems; (2) for any measure deemed by the auditor to be not achieved or partially achieved, the Postal Service shall continue to include its response explaining the Postal Service's mitigation plan; (3) the Postal Service shall file each audit report (and its response) with the Commission no later than 60 days after each applicable reporting quarter; and (4) the audit reports shall continue to specifically include inbound and outbound single-piece First-Class Mail International and the Green Card option of the Return Receipt as well as the metrics used to perform the audits and analysis specific to these types of services.

8. Typographical Changes and Updates to Language

The Postal Service suggests several minor changes to the languages of the service performance reporting requirement regulations, which it includes in an appendix to its comments. See Postal Service Comments at 17-18. Specifically, it suggests:

- The removal of factor (b)(1) in existing § 3055.65—referencing External First-Class Measurement (EXFC) seed mailpieces sent—because it no longer tracks this information.
- The removal of First-Class Package Service from existing §§ 3055.20 and 3055.45 because this product is now classified as competitive.

¹¹ See, e.g., FY 2022 Q2 Service Performance Measurement System - Cover Letter and Audit Report, Audit Response, and Measured/Unmeasured Volumes Report, May 31, 2022. The audit reports are published on the Commission's website, available at <http://www.prc.gov>; tab "Reports/Data Service Reports" and follow the "USPS Reports" hyperlink.

¹² See Order No. 4697 at 67; Docket No. PI2019-1, Order Granting Request and Approving Use of Internal Service Performance Measurement System, July 1, 2020, at 10-11 (Order No. 5576).

- Updating terminology, due to product and class name changes, in existing §§ 3055.20, 3055.21 and 3055.50.
- The removal of mentions of the overnight service standard (which no longer exists) from regulations pertaining to international First-Class Mail products in existing §§ 3055.20 and 3055.45.

Id. The Commission agrees with and incorporates the Postal Service's updates into the proposed rules.

IV. SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Proposed authority citation in part 3055. The Commission proposes to add cross-references to 39 U.S.C. 3653, 3692(b) and (c), and 3705 in the existing authority citation for part 3055. This proposed change aims to clarify the statutory provisions granting the Commission authority to promulgate regulations concerning service performance reporting, the Postal Service Public Performance Dashboard, and the quality of service for nonpostal services. The Commission also proposes to replace the existing cross-reference to 39 U.S.C. 3652(d) and (3) with a more general cross-reference to 39 U.S.C. 3652 to more fully reflect the Commission's authority concerning the Postal Service's annual reporting. The Commission also proposes to remove current cross-references to 39 U.S.C. 3622(a) and 3657 as these provisions are inapplicable.

Proposed § 3055.1. Proposed § 3055.1 adds competitive nonpostal service products to the category of products on which the Postal Service must report its annual service performance results. This proposed change codifies the new reporting requirement for nonpostal service products in 39 U.S.C. 3705.

Proposed § 3055.2(a). Proposed § 3055.2(a) replaces "(k)" with "(n)" to reflect the addition of new reporting requirements.

Proposed § 3055.2(j). Proposed § 3055.2(j) adds the new proposed requirement that graphical representations of data in the annual service performance reports be accompanied by the underlying data presented in spreadsheet form.

Proposed § 3055.2(l). Proposed § 3055.2(l) requires the Postal Service to provide the average actual days to delivery for Market Dominant products during the previous fiscal year at the District, Postal Administrative Area, and National levels. It also mandates that the Postal Service provide information about dispersion around the average for such data.

Proposed § 3055.2(m). Proposed § 3055.2(m) requires that the Postal Service provide a description of each Site-Specific Operating Plan, including on-time service performance information for each measurement category during the previous fiscal year at the National level and disaggregated by Division and Region.

Proposed § 3055.2(n). Proposed § 3055.2(n) requires that the Postal Service provide a description of the total mail measured and excluded for the previous fiscal year. Proposed § 3055.2(n)(1) specifies that the Postal Service must provide a report of the reasons that mailpieces were excluded during the previous fiscal year and provide a fillable template with the categories on which the Postal Service must report. Proposed § 3055.2(n)(2) specifies that the Postal Service must provide a description of the mail volumes measured and unmeasured during the previous fiscal year and include a fillable template identifying the required reporting categories. It also mandates that the Postal Service explain in detail any notations regarding its inability to collect any data. Proposed § 3055.2(n)(3) requires the Postal Service to provide descriptions of the current methodologies used to verify the accuracy, reliability, and representativeness of service performance data for each service performance measurement system.

Proposed § 3055.20. This section specifies the annual service performance reporting requirements for First-Class Mail. Proposed § 3055.20(a) and (b) amend the names of the products to reflect changes in terminology and clarify the service standards on which the Postal Service must report. Proposed § 3055.20(c) adds the requirement that the Postal Service must also report, for products that do not meet their service standards, point impact data for the top ten root causes of on-time service performance failures, at the Postal Administrative Area and National levels. Proposed § 3055.20(c) also provides a definition for “point impact data” and explains that the Postal

Service must identify and describe each type of root cause of failure as well as any changes to the Postal Service's methodology for calculating point impact data.

Proposed § 3055.21. This section specifies the annual service performance reporting requirements for USPS Marketing Mail, formerly known as "Standard Mail." Proposed § 3055.21 amends the name of the class in the section heading and text of subsection (a) and adds subsection (b), which requires the Postal Service must also report, for products that do not meet their service standards, point impact data for the top ten root causes of on-time service performance failures. Proposed § 3055.21(b) also provides a definition for "point impact data" and explains that the Postal Service must identify and describe each type of root cause of failure as well as any changes to the Postal Service's methodology for calculating point impact data.

Proposed § 3055.22. This section specifies the annual service performance reporting requirements for Periodicals. Proposed § 3055.22 adds subsection (b), which requires the Postal Service must also report, for products that do not meet their service standards, point impact data for the top ten root causes of on-time service performance failures. Proposed § 3055.22(b) also provides a definition for "point impact data" and explains that the Postal Service must identify and describe each type of root cause of failure as well as any changes to the Postal Service's methodology for calculating point impact data.

Proposed § 3055.23. This section specifies the annual service performance reporting requirements for Package Services. Proposed § 3055.23 adds subsection (b), which requires the Postal Service must also report, for products that do not meet their service standards, point impact data for the top ten root causes of on-time service performance failures. Proposed § 3055.22(b) also provides a definition for "point impact data" and explains that the Postal Service must identify and describe each type of root cause of failure as well as any changes to the Postal Service's methodology for calculating point impact data.

Proposed § 3055.25. Existing § 3055.25 is reserved for nonpostal products. Proposed § 3055.25 mandates that the Postal Service report on-time service

performance for nonpostal service products annually. This proposed change codifies the new reporting requirement for nonpostal service products in 39 U.S.C. 3705.

Proposed § 3055.30. Proposed § 3055.30 adds competitive nonpostal service products to the category of products on which the Postal Service must report its quarterly service performance achievements.

Proposed § 3055.31(a). Proposed § 3055.31(a) replaces “(e)” with “(h)” to reflect the addition of new reporting requirements.

Proposed § 3055.31(d). Proposed § 3055.31(d) adds the new proposed requirement that graphical representations of data in the quarterly service performance reports be accompanied by the underlying data presented in spreadsheet form.

Proposed § 3055.31(f). Proposed § 3055.31(f) requires the Postal Service to provide the average actual days to delivery for Market Dominant products during the previous fiscal quarter at the District, Postal Administrative Area, and National levels. It also mandates that the Postal Service provide information about dispersion around the average for such data.

Proposed § 3055.31(g). Proposed § 3055.31(g) requires that the Postal Service provide a description of each Site-Specific Operating Plan, including on-time service performance information for each measurement category during the previous fiscal quarter, disaggregated by Division, Region, and Nation.

Proposed § 3055.31(h). Proposed § 3055.31(h) requires that the Postal Service provide a description of the total mail measured and excluded for the previous fiscal quarter. Proposed § 3055.31(h)(1) specifies that the Postal Service must provide a report of the reasons that mailpieces were excluded during the previous fiscal quarter and provides a fillable template with the categories on which the Postal Service must report. Proposed § 3055.31(h)(2) specifies that the Postal Service must provide a description of the mail volumes measured and unmeasured during the previous fiscal quarter and also includes a fillable template identifying the required reporting categories. It also mandates that the Postal Service shall explain in detail any notations regarding its inability to collect any data. Proposed § 3055.31(h)(3) requires the Postal

Service to provide descriptions of the current methodologies used to verify the accuracy, reliability, and representativeness of service performance data for each service performance measurement system.

Proposed § 3055.31(i). Proposed § 3055.31(i) requires the Postal Service to provide a report of quarterly third-party audit results of its internal service performance measurement system for Market Dominant products, including a description of the measures used in, and the result of, the audit specific to inbound and outbound single-piece First-Class Mail International and the Green Card option of the Return Receipt service. It also specifies that, for any measure deemed by the auditor to be not achieved or only partially achieved, the Postal Service shall include in its report an explanation of its plan to achieve said measure in the future. The required report is due within 60 days of the close of each fiscal quarter. Proposed § 3055.31(i) is intended to codify current Commission requirements regarding Postal Service internal service performance measurement system audit reports.

Proposed § 3055.45. This section specifies the quarterly service performance reporting requirements for First-Class Mail. Proposed § 3055.45(a) and (b) amend the names of the products to reflect changes in terminology and clarify the service standards on which the Postal Service must report.

Proposed § 3055.50. This section specifies the quarterly service performance reporting requirements for USPS Marketing Mail, formerly known as “Standard Mail.” Proposed § 3055.50 amends the name of the class of products to reflect this change in the section heading and text of subsections (a) and (b).

Proposed § 3055.55. This section specifies the quarterly service performance reporting requirements for Periodicals. Proposed § 3055.55 amends the terminology to reflect changes in product name in the heading and text of subsection (a).

Proposed § 3055.60. This section specifies the quarterly service performance reporting requirements for Package Services. Proposed § 3055.60 removes subsections (a) and (c), which discusses Single-Piece Parcel Post and Inbound Surface Parcel Post, products that have been transferred to the Competitive product list. The

Commission proposes to redesignate the text of existing § 3055.60(b) to reflect these deletions. Proposed § 3055.60 simplifies the language of the section by removing individual product names, instead specifying that the service performance reporting requirements therein apply to all products within the Package Services class.

Proposed § 3055.65. Proposed § 3055.65 removes the reference to External First-Class Measurement, which is no longer used by the Postal Service to report results for the Green Card. See Order No. 5576 at 10. The Commission proposes to redesignate the remaining text of existing § 3055.65 to reflect this deletion.

Proposed § 3055.70. Existing § 3055.70 is reserved for nonpostal products. Proposed § 3055.70 mandates that the Postal Service report on-time service performance for nonpostal service products quarterly.

Proposed Subpart D. The Commission proposes to add a new subpart D to 39 CFR part 3055 relating to the Postal Service's Public Performance Dashboard.

Proposed § 3055.100. Proposed § 3055.100 provides definitions for relevant terms used in this subpart. Proposed § 3055.100 defines: actual delivery days, Election mail, Nonprofit mail, and Political mail.

Proposed § 3055.101. Proposed § 3055.101 requires the Postal Service to develop and maintain a publicly available website with an interactive web-tool that provides performance information for Market Dominant products. It also explains that the database should be updated weekly and cross-references reporting and formatting requirements that are set out in the subsequent sections.

Proposed § 3055.102. Proposed § 3055.102 details the specific requirements for the Postal Service's Public Performance Dashboard. It mandates that the Postal Service provide on-time service performance and average actual days to delivery information by Market Dominant class, product, and applicable service standard, with that information provided for the Nation and disaggregated by Postal Administrative Area, District, and Zip Code. It also requires that the dashboard provide service performance information based on certain area and time criteria input by a user. Proposed § 3055.102 also mandates that the Postal Service provide separate service

performance information for Political mail, Election mail, First-Class Mail that the Postal Service identifies as Single-Piece Reply Mail, and nonprofit USPS Marketing Mail and Periodicals mailpieces qualifying for reduced rates. Proposed § 3055.102 also requires the dashboard to contain certain information regarding ZIP Code groupings and service performance targets.

Proposed § 3055.103. Proposed § 3055.103 requires the Postal Service to provide the results of user-initiated queries on the Public Performance Dashboard in either a comma-separated or Excel data format. It also mandates that when there is a negative deviation from service performance standards, the dashboard should clearly indicate such deviation from expected performance and present the service performance from the prior week and prior fiscal year.

V. ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS

The Regulatory Flexibility Act requires federal agencies, in promulgating rules, to consider the impact of those rules on small entities. See 5 U.S.C. 601, *et seq.* (1980). If the proposed or final rules will not, if promulgated, have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities, the head of the agency may certify that the initial and final regulatory flexibility analysis requirements of 5 U.S.C. 603 and 604 do not apply. See 5 U.S.C. 605(b).

In the context of this rulemaking, the Commission's primary responsibility is in the regulatory oversight of the United States Postal Service. The rules that are the subject of this rulemaking have a regulatory impact on the Postal Service but do not impose any regulatory obligation upon any other entity. Based on these findings, the Chairman of the Commission certifies that the rules that are the subject of this rulemaking will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. Therefore, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 605(b), this rulemaking is exempt from the initial and final regulatory flexibility analysis requirements of 5 U.S.C. 603 and 604.

Interested persons are invited to provide written comments concerning the proposed amendments. Comments are due no later than 30 days after the date of

publication of this notice in the *Federal Register*. All comments and suggestions received will be available for review on the Commission's website, <http://www.prc.gov>. If the Postal Service claims that a potential modification is particularly onerous, involves costly new data collection, or does not appear to add useful transparency, the Postal Service is requested to quantify its incremental cost or burden.

Pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 505, Kenneth E. Richardson shall continue to serve as Public Representative in this proceeding.

VI. ORDERING PARAGRAPHS

It is ordered:

1. Interested persons may submit comments 30 days from the date of publication of this notice in the *Federal Register*.
2. Pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 505, Kenneth E. Richardson shall continue to serve as Public Representative in this proceeding.
3. The Secretary shall arrange for publication of the proposed rules and general statement as to the basis and purpose of the proposed rules in the *Federal Register*.

By the Commission.

Erica A. Barker
Secretary

List of Subjects in 39 CFR Part 3055

Administrative practice and procedure, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

For the reasons stated in the preamble, the Commission proposes to amend 39 CFR part 3055 as follows:

Part 3055—SERVICE PERFORMANCE AND CUSTOMER SATISFACTION REPORTING

1. The authority citation for part 3055 is revised to read as follows:

Authority: 39 U.S.C. 503; 3652; 3653; 3692(b) and (c); 3705.

Subpart A—Annual Reporting of Service Performance Achievements

2. Revise § 3055.1 to read as follows:

§ 3055.1 Annual Reporting of service performance achievements.

For each Market Dominant product specified in the Mail Classification Schedule in part 3040, appendix A to subpart A of part 3040 of this chapter (and for each competitive nonpostal service product specified in the Mail Classification Schedule in part 3040, appendix B to subpart A of part 3040 of this chapter), the Postal Service shall file a report as part of the section 3652 report addressing service performance achievements for the preceding fiscal year.

3. Amend § 3055.2 by revising paragraphs (a) and (j) and by adding paragraphs (l) through (n) to read as follows:

§ 3055.2 Contents of the annual report of service performance achievements.

(a) The items in paragraphs (b) through (n) of this section shall be included in the annual report of service performance achievements.

* * * * *

(j) Documentation showing how data reported at a given level of aggregation were derived from data reported at greater levels of disaggregation. Such documentation shall be in electronic format with all data links preserved. It shall show all formulas used, including volumes and other weighting factors. Any graphical representation of data provided shall also be accompanied by the underlying data presented in spreadsheet form.

* * * * *

(l) For each Market Dominant product, the average time in which the product was delivered, measured by actual delivery days, during the previous fiscal year, provided at the District, Postal Administrative Area, and National levels. "Actual delivery days" shall include all days in which Market Dominant products are eligible for delivery, excluding Sundays and holidays. Such information shall include the following information on dispersion around the average:

(1) the percent of mailpieces delivered within +1 day of the applicable service standard;

(2) the percent of mailpieces delivered within +2 days of the applicable service standard; and

(3) the percent of mailpieces delivered within +3 days of the applicable service standard.

(m) A description of each Site-Specific Operating Plan, including on-time service performance (as a percentage rounded to one decimal place) for each Site-Specific Operating Plan measurement category during the previous fiscal year. Such information shall be at the National level and disaggregated by Division and Region.

(n) A description of the total mail measured and excluded from measurement. Such description shall include:

(1) For each class of Market Dominant products (except Special Services), a report of the reasons that mailpieces were excluded from measurement during the previous fiscal year. The report shall include:

(i) the exclusion reason;

(ii) the exclusion description;

(iii) the number of mailpieces excluded from measurement, which is the sum of all mailpieces excluded from measurement for the individual exclusion reason; and

(iv) the exclusion reason as a percent of total mailpieces excluded from measurement, which is the number of mailpieces excluded from measurement (*i.e.*, provided in paragraph (n)(1)(iii) of this section) divided by the sum of all mailpieces excluded from measurement across all exclusion reason categories (*i.e.*, the sum of all values provided in paragraph (n)(1)(iii) of this section).

(2) The report described in paragraph (n)(1) of this section shall follow the format as shown below:

Table 1 – Exclusion Reasons Report for Fiscal Year

Exclusion Reason	Exclusion Description	Number of Mailpieces Excluded from Measurement	Exclusion Reason as a Percent of Total Exclusions

(3) For each class of Market Dominant products and for each Market Dominant product (except Special Services), a description of the mail volumes measured and unmeasured during the previous fiscal year. The description shall explain in detail any notations regarding the Postal Service’s inability to collect any data. Corresponding data shall also be provided for the same period last year (SPLY).

(4) The report described in paragraph (n)(3) of this section shall follow the format as shown below:

Table 2 – Total Mail Measured/Unmeasured Volumes Report for Fiscal Year

Class/Product	^^		^^		^^	
	Prior FY	SPLY	Prior FY	SPLY	Prior FY	SPLY
Total Number of Pieces (RPW-ODIS)						
Total Number of Pieces in Measurement						
Total Number of Pieces Eligible for Full-Service IMb						

Total Number of Full-Service IMb Pieces Included in Measurement						
Total Number of Full-Service IMb Pieces Excluded from Measurement						
Total Number of Pieces Not in Measurement						
% of Pieces in Measurement Compared to Total Pieces						
% of Pieces Not in Measurement Compared to Total Pieces						
% of Full-Service IMb Pieces in Measurement Compared to Total IMb Full-Service Pieces						
% of Full-Service IMb Pieces Not in Measurement Compared to Total IMb Full-Service Pieces						

(5) Descriptions of the current methodologies used to verify the accuracy, reliability, and representativeness of service performance data for each service performance measurement system.

§ 3055.7 [Removed and Reserved].

4. Remove and reserve § 3055.7.

5. Amend § 3055.20 by revising paragraphs (a) and (b) and by adding paragraph (c) to read as follows:

§ 3055.20 First-Class Mail.

(a) *Single-Piece Letters/Postcards, Presorted Letters/Postcards, and Flats.* For each of the Single-Piece Letters/Postcards, Presorted Letters/Postcards, and Flats products within the First-Class Mail class, report the on-time service performance (as a

percentage rounded to one decimal place), disaggregated by mail subject to the overnight, 2-day, 3-day, 4-day, and 5-day service standards, as well as in the aggregate for the 3-to-5-day service standards.

(b) *Outbound Single-Piece First-Class Mail International and Inbound Letter Post.* For each of the Outbound Single-Piece First-Class Mail International and Inbound Letter Post products within the First-Class Mail class, report the on-time service performance (as a percentage rounded to one decimal place), disaggregated by mail subject to the 2-day, 3-day, 4-day, and 5-day service standards, as well as in the aggregate for the 3-to-5-day service standards and in the aggregate for all service standards combined.

(c) For each product that does not meet its service goal during the reporting period, report the point impact data for the top ten root causes of on-time service performance failures, at the Postal Administrative Area and National levels, during the previous fiscal year. "Point impact data" means the number of percentage points by which on-time performance decreased due to a specific root cause of failure. Identification and a description of all potential root causes of failure assigned during the previous fiscal year and any changes to the Postal Service's methodology for calculating point impact data shall be included.

6. Revise § 3055.21 to read as follows:

§ 3055.21 USPS Marketing Mail.

(a) For each product within the USPS Marketing Mail class, report the on-time service performance (as a percentage rounded to one decimal place).

(b) For each product within the USPS Marketing Mail class that does not meet its service goal during the reporting period, report the point impact data for the top ten root causes of on-time service performance failures, at the National level, during the previous fiscal year. "Point impact data" means the number of percentage points by which on-time performance decreased due to a specific root cause of failure. Identification and a description of all potential root causes of failure assigned during the previous fiscal year and any changes to the Postal Service's methodology for calculating point impact data shall be included.

7. Revise § 3055.22 to read as follows:

§ 3055.22 Periodicals.

(a) For each product within the Periodicals class, report the on-time service performance (as a percentage rounded to one decimal place).

(b) For each product within the Periodicals class that does not meet its service goal during the reporting period, report the point impact data for the top ten root causes of on-time service performance failures, at the National level, during the previous fiscal year. "Point impact data" means the number of percentage points by which on-time performance decreased due to a specific root cause of failure. Identification and a description of all potential root causes of failure assigned during the previous fiscal year and any changes to the Postal Service's methodology for calculating point impact data shall be included.

8. Revise § 3055.23 to read as follows:

§ 3055.23 Package Services.

(a) For each product within the Package Services class, report the on-time service performance (as a percentage rounded to one decimal place).

(b) For each product within the Package Services class that does not meet its service goal during the reporting period, report the point impact data for the top ten root causes of on-time service performance failures, at the National level, during the previous fiscal year. "Point impact data" means the number of percentage points by which on-time performance decreased due to a specific root cause of failure. Identification and a description of all potential root causes of failure assigned during the previous fiscal year and any changes to the Postal Service's methodology for calculating point impact data shall be included.

9. Revise § 3055.25 to read as follows:

§ 3055.25 Nonpostal Products.

For each product that is a nonpostal service authorized pursuant to 39 U.S.C. chapter 37, the Postal Service shall report the on-time service performance (as a percentage rounded to one decimal place).

Subpart B—Periodic Reporting of Service Performance Achievements

10. Revise § 3055.30 to read as follows:

§ 3055.30 Periodic reporting of service performance achievements.

For each Market Dominant product specified in the Mail Classification Schedule in part 3040, appendix A to subpart A of part 3040 of this chapter (and for each competitive nonpostal service product specified in the Mail Classification Schedule in

part 3040, appendix B to subpart A of part 3040 of this chapter), the Postal Service shall file a Quarterly Report with the Commission addressing service performance achievements for the preceding fiscal quarter (within 40 days of the close of each fiscal quarter, except where otherwise specified by the Commission).

11. Amend § 3055.31 by revising paragraphs (a) and (d) and by adding paragraphs (f) through (i) to read as follows:

§ 3055.31 Contents of the Quarterly Report of service performance achievements.

(a) The items in paragraphs (b) through (h) of this section shall be included in the quarterly report of service performance achievements.

* * * * *

(d) Documentation showing how data reported at a given level of aggregation were derived from data reported at greater levels of disaggregation. Such documentation shall be in electronic format with all data links preserved. It shall show all formulas used, including volumes and other weighting factors. Any graphical representation of data provided shall also be accompanied by the underlying data presented in spreadsheet form.

* * * * *

(f) For each Market Dominant product, the average time in which the product was delivered, measured by actual delivery days, during the previous fiscal quarter, provided at the District, Postal Administrative Area, and National levels. "Actual delivery days" shall include all days in which Market Dominant products are eligible for delivery,

excluding Sundays and holidays. Such information shall include the following information on dispersion around the average:

(1) the percent of mailpieces delivered within +1 day of the applicable service standard;

(2) the percent of mailpieces delivered within +2 days of the applicable service standard; and

(3) the percent of mailpieces delivered within +3 days of the applicable service standard.

(g) A description of each Site-Specific Operating Plan, including on-time service performance (as a percentage rounded to one decimal place) for each Site-Specific Operating Plan measurement category during the previous fiscal quarter. Such information shall be by Nation and disaggregated by Division and Region.

(h) A description of the total mail measured and excluded from measurement. Such description shall include:

(1) For each class of Market Dominant products (except Special Services), a report of the reasons that mailpieces were excluded during the previous fiscal quarter.

The report shall include:

(i) the exclusion reason;

(ii) the exclusion reason description;

(iii) the number of mailpieces excluded from measurement, which is the sum of all mailpieces excluded from measurement for the individual exclusion reason; and

(iv) the exclusion reason as a percent of total mailpieces excluded from measurement, which is the number of mailpieces excluded from measurement (i.e., provided in paragraph (h)(1)(iii) of this section) divided by the sum of all mailpieces excluded from measurement across all exclusion reason categories (i.e., the sum of all values in provided in paragraph (h)(1)(iii) of this section).

(v) The report shall include information from each quarter in the applicable fiscal year.

(2) The report described in paragraph (h)(1) of this section shall follow the format as shown below:

Table 1 – Exclusion Reasons Report for Fiscal Quarter

Exclusion Reason	Exclusion Description	Number of Mailpieces Excluded from Measurement				Exclusion Reason as a Percent of Total Exclusions			
		Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4

(3) For each class of Market Dominant products and for each Market Dominant product (except Special Services), a description of the mail volumes measured and unmeasured during the previous fiscal quarter. The description shall explain in detail any notations regarding the Postal Service’s inability to collect any data. Corresponding data shall also be provided for the same period last year (SPLY). Each report is due within 60 days of the close of each fiscal quarter.

(4) The report described in paragraph (h)(3) of this section shall follow the format as shown below:

Table 2 – Total Mail Measured/Unmeasured Volumes Report for Fiscal Quarter

Class/Product	^^		^^		^^	
	Prior FQ	SPLY	Prior FQ	SPLY	Prior FQ	SPLY
Total Number of Pieces (RPW-ODIS)						
Total Number of Pieces in Measurements						
Total Number of Pieces Eligible for Full-Service IMb						
Total Number of Full-Service IMb Pieces Included in Measurement						
Total Number of Full-Service IMb Pieces Excluded from Measurement						
Total Number of Pieces Not in Measurement						
% of Pieces in Measurement Compared to Total Pieces						
% of Pieces Not in Measurement Compared to Total Pieces						
% of Full-Service IMb Pieces in Measurement Compared to Total IMb Full-Service Pieces						
% of Full-Service IMb Pieces Not in Measurement Compared to Total IMb Full-Service Pieces						

(i) A report of quarterly third-party audit results of its internal service performance measurement system for Market Dominant products. This report shall include a description of the audit measures used and the audit results specific to

inbound and outbound single-piece First-Class Mail International and the Green Card option of the Return Receipt service. For any measure deemed by the auditor to be not achieved or only partially achieved, the Postal Service shall include in its report an explanation of its plan to achieve said measure in the future. Each report is due within 60 days of the close of each fiscal quarter.

12. Revise § 3055.45 to read as follows:

§ 3055.45 First-Class Mail.

(a) *Single-Piece Letters/Postcards, Presorted Letters/Postcards, and Flats.* For each of the Single-Piece Letters/Postcards, Presorted Letters/Postcards, and Flats products within the First-Class Mail class, report the:

(1) On-time service performance (as a percentage rounded to one decimal place), disaggregated by mail subject to the overnight, 2-day, 3-day, 4-day, and 5-day service standards, as well as in the aggregate for the 3-to-5-day service standards, provided at the District, Postal Administrative Area, and National levels; and

(2) Service variance (as a percentage rounded to one decimal place) for mail delivered within +1 day, +2 days, and +3 days of its applicable service standard, disaggregated by mail subject to the overnight, 2-day, 3-day, 4-day, and 5-day service standards, as well as in the aggregate for the 3-to-5-day service standards, provided at the District, Postal Administrative Area, and National levels.

(b) *Outbound Single-Piece First-Class Mail International and Inbound Letter Post.* For each of the Outbound Single-Piece First-Class Mail International and Inbound Letter Post products within the First-Class Mail class, report the:

(1) On-time service performance (as a percentage rounded to one decimal place), disaggregated by mail subject to the 2-day, 3-day, 4-day, and 5-day service standards, as well as in the aggregate for the 3-to-5-day service standards and in the aggregate for all service standards combined, provided at the Postal Administrative Area and National levels; and

(2) Service variance (as a percentage rounded to one decimal place) for mail delivered within +1 day, +2 days, and +3 days of its applicable service standard, disaggregated by mail subject to the overnight, 2-day, 3-day, 4-day, and 5-day service standards, as well as in the aggregate for the 3-to-5-day service standards and in the aggregate for all service standards combined, provided at the Postal Administrative Area and National levels.

13. Revise § 3055.50 to read as follows:

§ 3055.50 USPS Marketing Mail.

(a) For each product within the USPS Marketing Mail class, report the on-time service performance (as a percentage rounded to one decimal place), disaggregated by the Destination Entry (2-day), Destination Entry (3-day through 4-day), Destination Entry (5-day through 10-day), End-to-End (3-day through 5-day), End-to-End (6-day through 10-day), and End-to-End (11-day through 22-day) entry mail/service standards, provided at the District, Postal Administrative Area, and National levels.

(b) For each product within the USPS Marketing Mail class, report the service variance (as a percentage rounded to one decimal place) for mail delivered within +1 day, +2 days, and +3 days of its applicable service standard, disaggregated by the

Destination Entry (2-day), Destination Entry (3-day through 4-day), Destination Entry (5-day through 10-day), End-to-End (3-day through 5-day), End-to-End (6-day through 10-day), and End-to-End (11-day through 22-day) entry mail/service standards, provided at the District, Postal Administrative Area, and National levels.

14. Amend § 3055.55 to revise the introductory text of paragraph (a) to read as follows:

§ 3055.55 Periodicals.

(a) *In-County Periodicals.* For the In-County Periodicals product within the Periodicals class, report the:

* * * * *

15. Revise § 3055.60 to read as follows:

§ 3055.60 Package Services.(a) For each product within the Package Services class, report the on-time service performance (as a percentage rounded to one decimal place), disaggregated by the Destination Entry and End-to-End entry mail, provided at the District, Postal Administrative Area, and National levels.

(b) For each product within the Package Services class, report the service variance (as a percentage rounded to one decimal place) for mail delivered within +1 day, +2 days, and +3 days of its applicable service standard, disaggregated by the Destination Entry and End-to-End entry mail, provided at the District, Postal Administrative Area, and National levels.

16. Amend § 3055.65(b) by removing paragraph (b)(1) and redesignating paragraphs (b)(2) through (b)(5) as paragraphs (b)(1) through (b)(4) to read as follows:

§ 3055.65 Special Services.

* * * * *

(b) * * *

- (1) The percentage of green cards properly completed and returned;
- (2) The percentage of green cards not properly completed, but returned;
- (3) The percentage of mailpieces returned without a green card signature; and
- (4) The percentage of the time the service meets or exceeds its overall service

standard.

* * * * *

17. Revise § 3055.70 to read as follows:

§ 3055.70 Nonpostal Products.

For each product that is a nonpostal service authorized pursuant to 39 U.S.C. chapter 37, the Postal Service shall report the on-time service performance (as a percentage rounded to one decimal place), provided at the District, Postal Administrative Area, and National levels.

18. Add subpart D to read as follows:

Subpart D – Public Performance Dashboard

Sec.

3055.100 Definitions applicable to this subpart.

3055.101 Public Performance Dashboard.

3055.102 Contents of the Public Performance Dashboard.

3055.103 Format for data provided in the Public Performance Dashboard.

§ 3055.100 Definitions applicable to this subpart.

(a) *Actual delivery days* refers to all days in which Market Dominant products are eligible for delivery, excluding Sundays and holidays.

(b) *Election mail* refers to items such as ballots, voter registration cards, and absentee applications that an authorized election official creates for voters.

(c) *Nonprofit mail* refers to USPS Marketing Mail mailpieces that qualify for reduced rates pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 3626(a)(6) and the regulations promulgated thereunder and Periodicals mailpieces that qualify for reduced rates pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 3626(a)(4) and the regulations promulgated thereunder.

(d) *Political mail* refers to any mailpiece sent for political campaign purposes by a registered candidate, a campaign committee, or a committee of a political party to promote candidates, referendums, or campaigns.

§ 3055.101 Public Performance Dashboard.

The Postal Service shall develop and maintain a publicly available website with an interactive web-tool that provides performance information for Market Dominant products. This website shall be updated on a weekly basis, no later than one month from the date of data collection. The website shall include, at a minimum, the reporting requirements specified in § 3055.102 and adhere to the formatting requirements specified in § 3055.103.

§ 3055.102 Contents of the Public Performance Dashboard.

(a) The items in paragraphs (b) through (l) of this section shall be included in the Public Performance Dashboard.

(b) Within each class of Market Dominant products, for each Market Dominant product and each service standard applicable to each Market Dominant product:

(1) the on-time service performance (as a percentage rounded to one decimal place) for the Nation;

(2) the on-time service performance (as a percentage rounded to one decimal place) for each Postal Administrative Area;

(3) the on-time service performance (as a percentage rounded to one decimal place) for each District; and

(4) the on-time service performance (as a percentage rounded to one decimal place) for each 5-Digit ZIP Code.

(c) Within each class of Market Dominant products, for each Market Dominant product and each applicable service standard:

(1) the average time in which the product was delivered, measured by actual delivery days, for the Nation;

(2) the average time in which the product was delivered, measured by actual delivery days, for each Postal Administrative Area;

(3) the average time in which the product was delivered, measured by actual delivery days, for each District; and

(4) the average time in which the product was delivered, measured by actual delivery days, for each 5-Digit ZIP Code.

(d) Within each class of Market Dominant products, for each Market Dominant product and each applicable service standard:

(1) the on-time service performance (as a percentage rounded to one decimal place) for any given time period that can be selected by a dashboard user within the previous two fiscal years; and

(2) the average time in which the product was delivered, measured by actual delivery days, for any given time period that can be selected by the dashboard user within the previous two fiscal years.

(e) Within each class of Market Dominant products, for each Market Dominant product and each applicable service standard:

(1) the on-time service performance (as a percentage rounded to one decimal place) for any given pair of origin/destination 3-Digit or 5-Digit ZIP Codes that can be selected by a dashboard user; and

(2) the average time in which the product was delivered, measured by actual delivery days, for any given pair of origin/destination 3-Digit or 5-Digit ZIP Codes to be selected by the dashboard user.

(f) For Political mail:

(1) the on-time service performance (as a percentage rounded to one decimal place) for the Nation;

(2) the on-time service performance (as a percentage rounded to one decimal place) for each Postal Administrative Area;

(3) the on-time service performance (as a percentage rounded to one decimal place) for each District;

(4) the on-time service performance (as a percentage rounded to one decimal place) for each 5-Digit ZIP Code;

(5) the average time in which the mailpieces were delivered, measured by actual delivery days, for the Nation;

(6) the average time in which the mailpieces were delivered, measured by actual delivery days, for each Postal Administrative Area;

(7) the average time in which the mailpieces were delivered, measured by actual delivery days, for each District; and

(8) the average time in which the mailpieces were delivered, measured by actual delivery days, for each 5-Digit ZIP Code.

(g) For Election mail:

(1) the on-time service performance (as a percentage rounded to one decimal place) for the Nation;

(2) the on-time service performance (as a percentage rounded to one decimal place) for each Postal Administrative Area;

(3) the on-time service performance (as a percentage rounded to one decimal place) for each District;

(4) the on-time service performance (as a percentage rounded to one decimal place) for each 5-Digit ZIP Code;

(5) the average time in which the mailpieces were delivered, measured by actual delivery days, for the Nation;

(6) the average time in which the mailpieces were delivered, measured by actual delivery days, for each Postal Administrative Area;

(7) the average time in which the mailpieces were delivered, measured by actual delivery days, for each District; and

(8) the average time in which the mailpieces were delivered, measured by actual delivery days, for each 5-Digit ZIP Code.

(h) For the First-Class Mail that the Postal Service identifies as Single-Piece Reply Mail:

(1) the on-time service performance (as a percentage rounded to one decimal place) for the Nation;

(2) the on-time service performance (as a percentage rounded to one decimal place) for each Postal Administrative Area;

(3) the on-time service performance (as a percentage rounded to one decimal place) for each District;

(4) the on-time service performance (as a percentage rounded to one decimal place) for each 5-Digit ZIP Code;

(5) the average time in which the mailpieces were delivered, measured by actual delivery days, for the Nation;

(6) the average time in which the mailpieces were delivered, measured by actual delivery days, for each Postal Administrative Area;

(7) the average time in which the mailpieces were delivered, measured by actual delivery days, for each District; and

(8) the average time in which the mailpieces were delivered, measured by actual delivery days, for each 5-Digit ZIP Code.

(i) For Nonprofit mail (within Periodicals and USPS Marketing Mail classes of mail):

(1) the on-time service performance (as a percentage rounded to one decimal place) for the Nation;

(2) the on-time service performance (as a percentage rounded to one decimal place) for each Postal Administrative Area;

(3) the on-time service performance (as a percentage rounded to one decimal place) for each District;

(4) the on-time service performance (as a percentage rounded to one decimal place) for each 5-Digit ZIP Code;

(5) the average time in which the mailpieces were delivered, measured by actual delivery days, for the Nation;

(6) the average time in which the mailpieces were delivered, measured by actual delivery days, for each Postal Administrative Area;

(7) the average time in which the mailpieces were delivered, measured by actual delivery days, for each District; and

(8) the average time in which the mailpieces were delivered, measured by actual delivery days, for each 5-Digit ZIP Code.

(9) the point impact data for the top ten root causes of on-time service performance failures, at the Postal Administrative Area and National levels. "Point

impact data” means the number of percentage points by which on-time performance decreased due to a specific root cause of failure. Identification and a description of all potential root causes of failure assigned during the previous fiscal year and any changes to the Postal Service’s methodology for calculating point impact data shall be included.

(j) For each Market Dominant product and applicable service standard, the on-time service performance target currently in effect, as well as the on-time service performance target for the previous fiscal year.

(k) A summary of the methodology used to group 5-Digit ZIP Codes into the Postal Administrative Areas and Districts with links to more detailed explanations if applicable.

(l) An application that would allow a dashboard user to initiate a query in order to access, for each Market Dominant product and applicable service standard, the on-time service performance (as a percentage rounded to one decimal place) and average time in which a mailpiece is delivered by inputting the user’s street address, 5-Digit ZIP Code, or post office box.

§ 3055.103 Format for data provided in the Public Performance Dashboard.

(1) The results of a user-initiated query and the data underlying the query results should be exportable via a machine-readable format, including but not limited to a comma-separated data file, an Excel spreadsheet, XML, or a JSON file, and such data should be made accessible to any person or entity utilizing tools and methods designed

to facilitate access to and extraction of data in bulk, such as an Application Programming Interface (API).

(2) When there is a negative deviation from service performance standards, the dashboard should clearly indicate such deviation from expected performance and present the service performance from the prior week and the same period last year.