I. Introduction

On June 12, 2015, the Postal Service filed a petition pursuant to 39 CFR 3050.11 requesting that the Commission initiate an informal rulemaking proceeding to consider changes to analytical principles relating to periodic reports. \(^1\) Text attached to the Petition identifies the proposed analytical method changes filed in this docket as Proposal One, Proposed Change in RPW Methodology for Forever Stamp Usage, Stamp Breakage, and PIHOP. \(^2\)

Attachment at 1. The Postal Service concurrently filed a non-public library reference, along with an application for nonpublic treatment. \(^2\)

II. Summary of Proposal

The Petition requests a change in methodology for the treatment of revenue, pieces, and weight (RPW) associated with forever stamp usage, breakage, and Postage-in-the-Hands-of-the-Public (PIHOP). Stamp breakage refers to the forever stamps that have been sold by the Postal Service but will never be used due to factors such as lost or damaged stamps and collectables. \(^3\) The estimated forever stamp usage is included in the current Book Revenue Adjustment Factor (BRAF) calculation. \(^4\) The Postal Service currently estimates PIHOP liability at the end of each accounting period. \(^5\) PIHOP liability is calculated by subtracting the stamp breakage and stamp usage from stamp sales. \(^6\)

The proposed changes include using the ODIS–RPW data collectors and expanded to national totals. \(^7\) A separate process calculates the value of the layer used, based on the different prices at which it was originally sold. \(^8\) The estimated forever stamp usage is removed from the ODIS–RPW estimates for forever stamp breakage and recognized as revenue for the Postal Service. \(^9\) This breakage percentage is applied to forever stamp sales for that layer and all remaining open forever stamp layers, until the remaining layers expire and become the new basis for estimating the breakage percentage. \(^10\)

The Postal Service currently estimates forever stamp breakage by assigning stamps a category and an issue year, known as a layer. \(^11\) When a layer of stamps is no longer available for sale and is determined to be at the end of its life cycle, as measured by the Origin Destination Information System (ODIS–RPW) system, the difference between cumulative sales and cumulative usage (calculated as a percentage) is deemed to be breakage and recognized as revenue for the Postal Service. \(^12\) This breakage percentage is applied to forever stamp sales for that layer and all remaining open forever stamp layers, until the remaining layers expire and become the new basis for estimating the breakage percentage. \(^13\)

Forever stamp usage is collected by ODIS–RPW data collectors and expanded to national totals. \(^14\) These separate processes calculate the value of the layer used, based on the different prices at which it was originally sold. \(^15\) The estimated forever stamp usage is removed from the ODIS–RPW estimates for forever stamp breakage and recognized as revenue for the Postal Service. \(^16\) These breakage percentages are applied to forever stamp sales for that layer and all remaining open forever stamp layers, until the remaining layers expire and become the new basis for estimating the breakage percentage. \(^17\)

The Postal Service currently estimates PIHOP liability at the end of each accounting period. \(^18\) PIHOP liability is calculated by subtracting the stamp breakage and stamp usage from stamp sales. \(^19\)

The proposed changes include using the ODIS–RPW estimates for forever stamp usage directly in the RPW Report. \(^20\) Under the proposal, two changes would occur in the BRAF formulation: forever stamp usage would be removed from the ODIS–RPW Single-Piece Sampling Revenue and forever stamp usage and forever stamp non-forever stamp breakage would be

---

\(^1\) Petition of the United States Postal Service Requesting: The Commission (Petition), June 12, 2015 (Petition).

removed from the residual total balance. Id. at 10. In addition, breakage from both forever and non-forever stamps would be assigned to Market Dominant Other Revenue in the RPW Report and PIHOP revenues, including meter PIHOP, will no longer be allocated directly to products. Id. at 11.

RPW reporting impacts. The Postal Service provides three tables that assess the impact of its proposal. Id. Table 1 shows the BRAF calculations for FY 2014 for current and proposed methodologies; Table 2 shows the FY 2014 RPW report for the current proposed methodologies; and Table 3 shows the same information for Quarter 2 Year-to-Date FY 2015. Id. at 11–12.

Library Reference USPS–FY2015–9/NP1 contains non-public versions of Tables 2 and 3. Id. at 12.

III. Initial Commission Action


IV. Ordering Paragraphs

It is ordered:


2. Comments are due no later than July 23, 2015. Reply comments are due no later than August 3, 2015. Pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 505, Anne C. O’Connor is designated as officer of the Commission (Public Representative) to represent the interests of the general public in this proceeding.

3. Pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 505, the Commission appoints Anne C. O’Connor to serve as an officer of the Commission (Public Representative) to represent the interests of the general public in this docket.

4. The Secretary shall arrange for publication of this order in the Federal Register.

By the Commission.

Shoshana M. Grove,
Secretary.
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Medical Examination of Aliens—Revisions to Medical Screening Process

AGENCY: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS).

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), within the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), is issuing this Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) to amend its regulations governing medical examinations that aliens must undergo before they may be admitted to the United States. Specifically, HHS/CDC proposes to: revise the definition of communicable disease of public health significance by removing chancroid, granuloma inguinale, and lymphogranuloma venereum as inadmissible health-related conditions for aliens seeking admission to the United States; update the notification of the health-related grounds of inadmissibility to include proof of vaccinations to align with existing requirements established by the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA); revise the definitions and evaluation criteria for mental disorders, drug abuse and drug addiction; clarify and revise the evaluation requirements for tuberculosis; clarify and revise the process for the HHS/CDC-appointed medical review board that convenes to reexamine the determination of a Class A medical condition based on an appeal; and update the titles and designations of federal agencies within the text of the regulation.

DATES: Written comments must be received on or before August 24, 2015.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments, identified by the Regulatory Information Number (RIN) 0920–AA26 or the Docket Number CDC–2015–0045 in the heading of this document by any of the following methods:

• Federal eRulemaking Portal: http://www.regulations.gov. Follow the instructions for submitting comments.

• Mail: Division of Global Migration and Quarantine, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 1600 Clifton Road, NE., MS E–03, Atlanta, GA 30333, ATTN: Part 34.

• Hand Delivery/Courier: Division of Global Migration and Quarantine, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 1600 Clifton Road, NE., MS E–03, Atlanta, GA 30333, ATTN: Part 34.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ashley A. Marrone, J.D., Division of Global Migration and Quarantine, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 1600 Clifton Road, NE., MS E–03, Atlanta, Georgia 30333; telephone 1–866–694–4867, and ask for a representative in the Division of Global Migration and Quarantine to schedule your visit.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Preamble to this NPRM is organized as follows:

I. Public Participation

II. Legal Authority

III. Background

A. Inadmissibility and the Medical Examination

B. Applicability of part 34

C. Legislative and Regulatory History

IV. Rationale for Proposed Regulatory Action

A. Section 34.2 Definitions

B. Section 34.3 Scope of Examinations

C. Section 34.4 Medical Notifications

D. Section 34.7 Medical and Other Care; Death

E. Section 34.8 Reexamination; Convening of Review Boards; Expert Witnesses, Reports

V. Alternatives Considered

VI. Required Regulatory Analyses

A. Executive Orders 12866 and 13563

B. The Regulatory Flexibility Act

C. The Paperwork Reduction Act

D. National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)

E. Executive Order 12988: Civil Justice Reform

F. Executive Order 13132: Federalism

G. The Plain Language Act of 2010

VII. References

I. Public Participation

Interested persons are invited to participate in this rulemaking by...