

invites the general public and other Federal Agencies to comment on the proposed information collection, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

Ex-Im Bank's borrowers, financial institution policy holders and guaranteed lenders provide this form to U.S. exporters, who certify to the eligibility of their exports for Ex-Im Bank support. For direct loans and loan guarantees, the completed form is required to be submitted at time of disbursement and held by either the guaranteed lender or Ex-Im Bank. For MT insurance, the completed forms are held by the financial institution, only to be submitted to Ex-Im Bank in the event of a claim filing. Ex-Im Bank believes that EIB 11-05 requires emergency approval in order to continue operation of its long- and medium-term financing programs. It is an integral component of the programs and is heavily used.

Lack of an emergency approval of this form would preclude our ability to continue operation of its long- and medium-term financial institution programs. Ex-Im Bank developed the referenced form to obtain exporter certifications regarding the export transaction, content sourcing, and their eligibility to participate in USG programs. These details are necessary to determine the value and legitimacy of Ex-Im Bank financing support and claims submitted. It also provides the financial institutions a check on the export transaction's eligibility at the time it is fulfilling a financing request.

Accordingly, Ex-Im Bank requests emergency approval of EIB 11-05 in order to continue operation of these important export programs.

The form can be viewed at: [www.exim.gov/pub/pending/eib11-05.pdf](http://www.exim.gov/pub/pending/eib11-05.pdf).

**DATES:** Comments should be received on or before October 25, 2012 to be assured of consideration.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments may be submitted electronically on [WWW.REGULATIONS.GOV](http://WWW.REGULATIONS.GOV) or by mail to Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, 725 17th Street NW., Washington, DC 20038 Attn: OMB 3048-XXXX.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Titles and Form Number EIB 11-05 Exporter's Certificate for Direct Loan, Loan Guarantee & MT Insurance Programs**

*OMB Number:* 3048-0043.

*Type of Review:* New.

*Need and Use:* The information collected will provide information needed to determine compliance and content for transaction requests

submitted to the Export-Import Bank under its insurance, guarantee, and direct loan programs.

*Affected Public:* This form affects entities involved in the export of U.S. goods and services.

*Annual Number of Respondents:* 4,000.

*Estimated Time per Respondent:* 30 minutes.

*Total Burden:* 2,000 hours.

Government Reviews only forms when a claim is filed—in FY 2011 54 claims were filed utilizing this form.

*Government Annual Burden Hours:* 54.

*Frequency of Reporting or Use:* As needed.

*Total Cost to the Government:* \$2,090.88.

**Sharon A. Whitt,**

*Agency Clearance Officer.*

[FR Doc. 2012-23561 Filed 9-24-12; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6690-01-P**

**FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION**

**Information Collection Being Reviewed by the Federal Communications Commission**

**AGENCY:** Federal Communications Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice and request for comments.

**SUMMARY:** The Federal Communications Commission (FCC), as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork burdens, invites the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on the following information collection, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) of 1995. Comments are requested concerning whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Commission, including whether the information shall have practical utility; the accuracy of the Commission's burden estimate; ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information collected; ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on the respondents, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology; and ways to further reduce the information collection burden on small business concerns with fewer than 25 employees.

The FCC may not conduct or sponsor a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid control

number. No person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information subject to the PRA that does not display a valid Office of Management and Budget (OMB) control number.

**DATES:** Written PRA comments should be submitted on or before November 26, 2012. If you anticipate that you will be submitting comments, but find it difficult to do so within the period of time allowed by this notice, you should advise the contact listed below as soon as possible.

**ADDRESSES:** Direct all PRA comments to the Federal Communications Commission via email to [PRA@fcc.gov](mailto:PRA@fcc.gov) and [Cathy.Williams@fcc.gov](mailto:Cathy.Williams@fcc.gov).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** For additional information about the information collection, contact Cathy Williams at (202) 418-2918.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

*OMB Control Number:* 3060-0692.

*Type of Review:* Extension of a currently approved collection.

*Title:* Sections 76.802 and 76.804, Home Wiring Provisions; Section 76.613, Interference from a Multi-channel Video Programming Distributor (MVPD).

*Form Number:* N/A.

*Respondents:* Individuals or households; Business or other for-profit entities.

*Number of Respondents:* 22,000.

*Estimated Time per Response:* 0.083—2 hours.

*Frequency of Response:* On occasion reporting requirement; Recordkeeping requirement; Annual reporting requirement; Third party disclosure requirement.

*Obligation to Respond:* Required to obtain or retain benefits. The statutory authority for this collection is contained in Sections 1, 4, 224, 251, 303, 601, 623, 624 and 632 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended.

*Total Annual Burden:* 36,114 hours.

*Total Annual Cost:* None.

*Privacy Act Impact Assessment:* No impact(s).

*Nature and Extent of Confidentiality:*

There is no need for confidentiality with this collection of information.

*Needs and Uses:* In the Cable Television Consumer Protection and Competition Act of 1992, Congress directed the FCC to adopt rules governing the disposition of home wiring owned by a cable operator when a subscriber terminates service. The rules at 76.800 et seq., implement that directive. The intention of the rules is to clarify the status and provide for the disposition of existing cable operator-owned wiring in single family homes

and multiple dwelling units upon the termination of a contract for cable service by the home owner or MDU owner. Section 76.613(d) requires that when Multichannel Video Programming Distributors (MVPDs) cause harmful signal interference MVPDs may be required by the District Director and/or Resident Agent to prepare and submit a report regarding the cause(s) of the interference, corrective measures planned or taken, and the efficacy of the remedial measures.

Federal Communications Commission.

**Gloria J. Miles,**

*Federal Register Liaison, Office of the Secretary, Office of Managing Director.*

[FR Doc. 2012-23535 Filed 9-24-12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-P

## FEDERAL HOUSING FINANCE AGENCY

[No. 2012-N-13]

### State-Level Guarantee Fee Pricing

**AGENCY:** Federal Housing Finance Agency.

**ACTION:** Notice; input accepted.

The Federal Housing Finance Agency (FHFA) oversees the operations of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac (“the Enterprises”). The Enterprises are in conservatorships, and, as Conservator, FHFA has statutory obligations in its conduct of the conservatorships, including preserving and conserving assets. Though the Enterprises are congressionally chartered and federally supervised and regulated, state laws and practices can have a significant impact on their loan default costs.

This Notice sets forth an approach to adjust the guarantee fees (“g-fees”) that the Enterprises charge for mortgages that finance properties with one to four units (“single-family mortgages”) in certain states to recover a portion of the exceptionally high costs that the Enterprises incur in cases of mortgage default in those states.

### Background

The Enterprises charge g-fees to compensate for the credit risks they undertake when they own or guarantee mortgages. The g-fees the Enterprises currently charge on single-family mortgages vary with the type of loan product and with loan and borrower attributes that affect credit risk. FHFA has a responsibility to ensure that those fees are proper and adequate. The single-family g-fees that the Enterprises charged prior to conservatorship proved inadequate to compensate for the level

of actual credit losses they experienced. This contributed directly to substantial financial support being provided to the two companies by taxpayers.

G-fee payments to Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac generally include both ongoing monthly payments and an upfront payment at the time of Enterprise loan acquisition. Current Enterprise schedules for upfront g-fees may be found at <https://www.efanniemae.com/sf/refmaterials/llpa/pdf/llpamatrix.pdf> and <http://www.freddiemac.com/singlefamily/pdf/ex19.pdf>.

Recent experience has shown a wide variation among states in the costs that the Enterprises incur from mortgage defaults. This is due, in large part, to differences among the states and territories in the requirements for lenders or other investors to manage a default, foreclose, and obtain marketable title to the property backing a single-family mortgage. Foreclosure takes longer than average in some states as a result of regulatory or judicial actions. Further, in some states the investor cannot market a property for a period after foreclosure is complete. There is also variation among the states in the per-day carrying costs that investors incur during the periods when a defaulted loan is non-performing and, in some states, when a foreclosed property cannot be marketed. Those variations in time periods and per-day carrying costs interact to contribute to state-level differences in the average total carrying cost to investors of addressing a loan default. Because the Enterprises currently set their g-fees nationally, accounting for expected default costs only in the aggregate, borrowers in states with lower default-related carrying costs are effectively subsidizing borrowers in states with higher costs.

The principal drivers of differences across states in the average total carrying costs to the Enterprises of a defaulted single-family mortgage are, in order of importance—

1. The length of time needed to secure marketable title to the property;
2. Property taxes that must be paid until marketable title is secured; and
3. Legal and operational expenses during that period.

There is a wide variation among states in all three of those variables.

In light of these cost differentials, FHFA’s March 2012 Conservatorship Scorecard set forth the objective for Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac of developing appropriate risk-based guarantee fee pricing by state. FHFA’s proposal described here would adjust the upfront fees that the Enterprises

charge when they acquire single-family mortgages in states where Enterprise costs that are related to state foreclosure practices are statistically higher than the national average. The size of the adjustments would reflect differences in costs in those states from the average.

FHFA recognizes that the data the Enterprises have used to calculate state-level cost differences in this proposal are based on a combination of Enterprise experience and estimation. Actual costs incurred by the Enterprises in the future may vary over time and among individual defaults within a state. Because of this variability, FHFA’s planned approach focuses on five states that are clear outliers among states in terms of their default-related costs.

This document outlines the approach that FHFA is considering and discusses potential additions and changes to the calculation of such fees in the future. Through this Notice, FHFA is providing an opportunity for public input on these subjects. After reviewing the public input and determining a final state-level guarantee fee pricing method, FHFA expects to direct the Enterprises to implement the pricing adjustments in 2013.

### Approach to State-Level G-Fee Adjustments

The approach set forth in this Notice is based on Enterprise experience and does not include the forward-looking impact of recently-enacted state and local laws that may increase the Enterprises’ costs. FHFA intends to periodically reassess state-level pricing based on updated Enterprise data. The agency may include the impact of newly-enacted laws if they clearly affect foreclosure timelines or costs, where such costs may be reasonably estimated based on relevant experience.

FHFA’s approach would focus on the small number of states that have average total carrying costs that significantly exceed the national average and, therefore, impose the greatest costs on Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac, and taxpayers. Mortgages originated in these highest-cost states would have an upfront fee of between 15 and 30 basis points, which would be charged to lenders as a one-time upfront payment on each loan acquired by the Enterprises after implementation. Based on current data as described below, those five states are Connecticut, Florida, Illinois, New Jersey, and New York.

Lenders may pass an upfront fee through to a borrower as an adjustment to the interest rate on the borrower’s loan. Because the upfront fee is paid only once, its impact on the annual interest rate is much smaller than the