

attempting to submit a complaint, question, or tip to the Department regarding the LMRDA or other relevant federal law could do so solely via telephone or email, leading to potential confusion and inability to ensure their complaint was received and difficulty for OLMS to track the complaint. The OIG found that having an online complaint intake form is the best practice for receiving complaints and tips from the public concerning potential violations of the LMRDA's employer and consultant reporting requirements and recommended that OLMS create an online system through which it could receive such information from the public.

To fulfill the OIG recommendation, and to ensure that members of the public have a clear and efficient method to contact OLMS with complaints, tips, or questions, the Department proposes a new information collection entitled, "OLMS Public Submission Portal." The OLMS Public Submission Portal would be an online complaint, question, and tip system wherein any member of the public could submit complaints, tips, and inquiries concerning any aspect of the laws enforced by OLMS, specifically, the "Persuader Tip Submission, Union Officer Election Complaint or Inquiry, Embezzlement/ Financial Misconduct, LM Report Inquiries, and Public Inquiry and Complaint Forms," for review by OLMS. These forms would gather information from all respondents including personal contact information, the nature of their issue, and any details OLMS may need to best address their concerns. In relevant cases, an individual would be able to submit the form anonymously if they did not wish to be identified. Upon submission of the form, the respondent would receive confirmation of their submission. OLMS staff would then document the information in a new database and use the information provided on the form to review the issue, contact the submitter when appropriate and when contact information is provided, and determine whether further investigation into the allegations or issues raised may be required. For complaints whose information does not support OLMS action, complainants would be advised and referred to an appropriate agency, if any, for further assistance.

The Department estimates that it will receive approximately 3,500 responses on the OLMS Public Submission Portal, which is based on the Department's current methods of collecting complaints via email. In addition, the Department estimates that approximately 5 percent of these

responses will come from respondents who have already filed a form on the OLMS Public Submission Portal, leading to a total of 3,325 annual respondents. Finally, the Department estimates that, based on the length and relative non-complexity of the forms, each response will take approximately 10 minutes to complete. As a result, the Department estimates an annual burden hour total of 583.33 hours for this information collection.

The Department invites comments on how members of the public would use the OLMS Public Submission Portal and the associated burden estimates. Comments submitted in response to this notice will be summarized and/or included in the submission to OMB for approval of the information collection request; they will also become a matter of public record. Commenters are encouraged not to submit sensitive information (e.g., confidential business information, personally identifiable information such as a social security number).

This information collection is subject to the PRA. A Federal agency generally cannot conduct or sponsor a collection of information, and the public is generally not required to respond to an information collection, unless the OMB approves it and displays a currently valid OMB Control Number. In addition, notwithstanding any other provisions of law, no person shall generally be subject to penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information that does not display a valid OMB Control Number. See 5 CFR 1320.5(a) and 1320.6.

The Department seeks PRA authorization for this information collection for three (3) years. OMB authorization for an ICR cannot be for more than three (3) years without renewal.

Agency: DOL-OLMS.

Type of Review: New.

Title of Collection: OLMS Public Submission Portal.

OMB Control Number: 1245-0NEW.

Affected Public: Private Sector.

Total Estimated Number of Respondents: 3,325.

Frequency: Varies.

Total Estimated Number of Responses: 3,500.

Estimated Average Time per Response: 10 minutes.

Total Estimated Annual Time Burden: 595 hours.

Total Estimated Annual Other Costs Burden: \$0.

(Authority: 44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A)).

Andrew C. Hasty,

Chief of the OLMS Division of Interpretations and Regulations.

[FR Doc. 2026-21345 Filed 10-16-26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-86-P

LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

Notice of Revisions to Performance Area One of the LSC Performance Criteria

AGENCY: Legal Services Corporation.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Legal Services Corporation (LSC) announces revisions to Performance Area One of its Performance Criteria. In Performance Area One, LSC established the indicators that LSC will use to evaluate grant recipients' processes for identifying the most pressing and emerging legal needs in their service areas and determining how they will deliver legal services tailored to most effectively address those needs. LSC is adopting a new criterion assessing strategic planning in addition to revising the existing criteria examining grant recipients' conduct of needs assessments, implementation of strategies to address legal needs, and self-examination of their effectiveness in delivering legal services.

DATES: The revised Performance Area will become effective on January 1, 2027.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Stefanie K. Davis, Deputy General Counsel, Legal Services Corporation, 1825 I Street NW, Suite 800, Washington, DC 20006, 202-295-1563, performancearea1@lsc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: LSC is revising Performance Area One of its Performance Criteria for the first time since 2007. The revisions to Performance Area One reflect trends in the delivery of legal services, particularly with respect to the evolution in non-profit management, including the increased use of technology; the increasing prevalence of state access to justice commissions; and a changed legal aid funding landscape. While the detail in and number of Areas of Inquiry and Indicators have expanded through this Revision, LSC's intention for the Performance Criteria has not changed. The Criteria remain, as LSC stated in 2007, "a useful framework for internal program self-evaluations, planning, and program development, as well as external peer reviews and expert assessments by other funding sources,

such as IOLTA programs and government agencies.” Legal Services Corporation, Performance Criteria, p. 1 (March 2007).

LSC undertook the Revisions to Performance Area One for several reasons. First, nonprofit management has evolved greatly in the last two decades focusing on increased professionalism, revenue diversification, data-driven accountability, and enhanced board governance and leadership practices.

Additionally, in 2021, the American Bar Association adopted revisions to its Standards for the Provision of Civil Legal Aid (Standards). The 2006 Standards guided LSC’s development of the 2007 Performance Criteria. Consequently, LSC determined that it was appropriate to review and revise the Performance Criteria to the extent that they complement the Standards.

In a similar vein, LSC was motivated to update Performance Area One to reflect the efficiencies developed by legal services providers and created by technology. The delivery of legal services has changed significantly since 2007, with case management systems becoming more sophisticated in terms of the data they can collect and aggregate; legal aid organizations and courts conducting more business through videoconferencing and providing more legal information via mobile apps; and the nascence of artificial intelligence in intake and case management. Technological changes have also affected the ways in which legal services organizations and their partners conduct needs assessments and engage in strategic planning. The revisions to Performance Area One take these changes into account and ask evaluators to consider whether, and to what extent, legal aid organizations are using these strategies in their planning and operations.

Finally, LSC wanted to improve the structure and utility of Performance Area One as an evaluation tool. Although LSC has introduced new Areas of Inquiry and Indicators, LSC is presenting all Areas and Indicators in simpler, clearer language. LSC has also reorganized and renamed the four Criteria within Performance Area One to better reflect the needs assessment, strategic planning, implementation, and evaluation cycle.

LSC published the revisions to Performance Area One for public comment in early October 2025. During the comment period, LSC received eleven unique comments from executive directors of LSC grantees, collectives of LSC grantees, and national legal organizations. These commenters raised

several concerns centered around the idea that LSC was taking the Performance Criteria in a more prescriptive direction. First, they stated that the proposed language appeared to turn the Performance Criteria into another enforcement tool rather than guidance. Second, they expressed concern that LSC was emphasizing numbers of clients served rather than overall impact on the client population in a grantee’s service area. Finally, they opined that it appeared LSC expected all grantees, regardless of size, funding level, or service area characteristics, to conform to the same rigid schedule and elements of needs assessment and strategic planning. LSC did not intend to change the evaluation-centered focus of Performance Area One or to require all grantees to focus only on serving as many individual clients as possible, regardless of the needs in their respective service areas. LSC appreciates the concerns raised by these commenters and has revised the introduction to Performance Area One, introductions to each of the Criteria, and the Areas of Inquiry and Indicators as needed to resolve those concerns.

LSC has published the revised Performance Area 1 on its website at <https://www.lsc.gov/our-impact/publications/other-publications-and-reports/lsc-performance-criteria>. LSC will begin using the revised Performance Area 1 on January 1, 2027. LSC recognizes that it may take time, guidance, and experience for all grantees to adjust to the revisions. LSC will, therefore, provide training and forums to discuss the implementation of the changes. When conducting program assessments, LSC staff will take the scope of the revisions and each program’s capacity into consideration when making recommendations.

Overview of Changes

LSC revised Performance Area One to clarify and enhance existing guidance by presenting a more structured and integrated framework for legal aid organizations to consider in carrying out their work. The current version of the Performance Criteria describes core concepts in a more narrative format. The proposed revisions reorganize these concepts to more clearly reflect the relationship among needs assessment, strategic planning, priority setting, and evaluation. This reorganization is intended to help grantees understand how these activities may operate together as part of an ongoing process, while preserving flexibility and not prescribing a single required approach.

The proposed revisions also provide additional details to illustrate

considerations that may inform an organization’s approach. For example, under Criterion 1 (Needs Assessment), the proposed indicators describe a range of methods that organizations might use to identify the most pressing legal needs of their client communities, including consultation with community partners, review of available data, and use of information gathered during statewide assessments (see Proposed Indicators 1 and 2). The new indicators further describe ways in which organizations may consider the needs of different populations and the role that other service providers in the service area play in serving their shared client populations (see Proposed Indicators 3 and 4). These revisions are intended to provide greater clarity regarding the types of information that may be relevant to a comprehensive assessment, without requiring the use of any particular methodology.

Under Criterion 2 (Strategic Planning), the proposed revisions describe how organizations might use the results of a needs assessment to inform planning processes. For example, the proposed indicators ask questions about how the results of a grantee’s needs assessment influence the grantee’s development of a written strategic plan (see Proposed Indicator 1). Additional indicators describe considerations that may inform the planning process, such as stakeholder engagement, use of quantitative and qualitative data, and alignment with organizational capacity and resources (see Proposed Indicators 2 through 4). These provisions are intended to identify factors that grantees may consider when structuring their planning efforts.

The revisions to Criterion 3 (Priority Setting and Case Acceptance Policy) describe how organizations might translate planning decisions into operational practices. For example, the proposed indicators address the establishment of service priorities that reflect identified needs and strategic objectives, as well as the adoption of a written case acceptance policy to guide service delivery (see Proposed Indicators 1 and 3). The new indicators also describe alternative approaches that organizations may consider when full representation is not feasible, including referrals, collaboration with other providers, and the use of technology (see Proposed Indicator 4). These examples are intended to help organizations consider a range of options for delivering services within available resources.

Finally, under Criterion 4 (Evaluation), the revised indicators

describe approaches that grantees might use to assess the effectiveness of their work and make appropriate adjustments over time. These include evaluating the alignment of services with established priorities, using data and stakeholder input to inform decision-making, and maintaining flexibility to respond to changing conditions (see Proposed Indicators 1 and 2). The revisions also describe the role of ongoing review in supporting continuous improvement and responsiveness to emerging needs.

Overall, LSC intended the revisions to improve the clarity, organization, and usability of the Performance Criteria by providing more detailed lists of factors that grantees may find useful. LSC did not intend to establish new requirements, but rather to offer guidance that legal aid organizations may adapt based on their individual circumstances, including their size, capacity, and the needs of the communities they serve.

ChatGPT was used to draft this document. The generated content provided structural and content suggestions, which the author reviewed, adapted, and revised for LSC's specific needs and tone.

(Authority: 42 U.S.C. 2996g(e).)

October 14, 2026.

Stefanie Davis,

Deputy General Counsel, Legal Services Corporation.

[FR Doc. 2026–21254 Filed 10–16–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7050–01–P

NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS ADMINISTRATION

[NARA–2027–003]

Agency Information Collection Activities: Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

AGENCY: National Archives and Records Administration (NARA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: We have submitted a request to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for renewal of the Generic Information Collection Request (Generic ICR): “Generic Clearance for the Collection of Qualitative Feedback on Agency Service Delivery.” This ICR expires in December 2026. As part of a Federal Government-wide effort to streamline the process to seek feedback from the public on service delivery, this generic ICR covers all of our requests for feedback on our services. We invite you to comment on the proposed information collections.

DATES: OMB must receive written comments on or before November 18, 2026.

ADDRESSES: Send any comments and recommendations on the proposed information collection in writing to www.reginfo.gov/public/do/PRAMain. You can find this particular information collection by selecting “Currently under 30-day Review—Open for Public Comments” or by using the search function.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Requests for additional information or copies of the proposed information collection and supporting statement should be directed to Kristin Phillips, Paperwork Reduction Act Officer, by email at kristin.phillips@nara.gov or by telephone at 616–254–0405.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Public Law 104–13), we invite the public and other Federal agencies to comment on proposed information collections. We published a notice of proposed collection for this information collection on July 23, 2026 (91 FR 46487) and we received one comment. The comment was not applicable to the information collection NARA proposed for renewal because it is not relevant to the proposed information collection or the agency. As a result, we have not modified the proposed information collection based on this comment. We are therefore submitting the described information collection to OMB for approval.

If you have comments or suggestions, they should address one or more of the following points: (a) whether the proposed information collection is necessary for NARA to properly perform its functions; (b) our estimate of the burden of the proposed information collection and its accuracy; (c) ways we could enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information we collect; (d) ways we could minimize the burden on respondents of collecting the information, including through information technology; and (e) whether this collection affects small businesses.

In this notice, we solicit comments concerning the following information collection:

Title: Generic Clearance for the Collection of Qualitative Feedback on Agency Service Delivery.

OMB Number: 3095–0070.

Type of Review: Regular.

Affected Public: Individuals and Households, Businesses and Organizations, State, Local or Tribal Governments.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 27,000.

Below we provide projected average estimates for the next three years:

Average expected annual number of activities: 26.

Average number of respondents per activity: 1,038.

Annual responses: 1.

Frequency of response: Once per request.

Average minutes per response: 10–30.

Burden hours: 13,500.

Abstract: This information collection activity provides a means to gather qualitative customer and stakeholder feedback in an efficient, timely manner, in accordance with NARA's commitment to improving service delivery. By qualitative feedback, we mean information that provides useful insights into customers' or stakeholders' perceptions and opinions, but not statistical surveys that yield quantitative results that can be generalized to the population of study. Qualitative feedback provides insights into perceptions, experiences, and expectations, provides an early warning of issues with service, or focuses attention on areas where communication, training, or changes in operations might improve delivery of products or services. Collecting this information allows for ongoing, collaborative, and actionable communications between NARA and its customers and stakeholders. It also allows us to contribute feedback directly to improving program management.

NARA collects feedback in areas of service delivery such as timeliness, appropriateness, accuracy of information, plain language, courtesy, efficiency, and resolution of issues with service delivery. We use customer feedback to plan efforts to improve or maintain the quality of service offered to the public. If this information is not collected, vital feedback from customers and stakeholders on NARA's services will be unavailable.

NARA will only submit a collection for approval under this generic clearance if it meets the following conditions:

- The collection is voluntary;
- The collection is low-burden for respondents (based on considerations of total burden hours, total number of respondents, or burden-hours per respondent) and is low-cost for both the respondents and the Federal Government;
- The collection is non-controversial and does not raise issues of concern to other Federal agencies;
- It is targeted to solicit opinions from respondents who have experience with the program or may have