

able simply to take the parties' word that the efficiencies they have identified will actually materialize. Ultimately, we evaluate evidence related to efficiencies under the same standard we apply to any other evidence of competitive effects.<sup>15</sup>

The lack of guidance in analyzing and crediting efficiencies has led to significant uncertainty as to what standard the Agency applies in practice to efficiency claims and led to inconsistent applications of Section 10 of the Merger Guidelines, even among agency staff.<sup>16</sup> In my view, standard microeconomic analysis should guide how we interpret Section 10 of the 2010 Merger Guidelines, as it does the rest of the antitrust law. To the extent the Merger Guidelines are interpreted or applied to impose asymmetric burdens upon the agencies and parties to establish anticompetitive effects and efficiencies, respectively, such interpretations do not make economic sense and are inconsistent with a merger policy designed to promote consumer welfare.<sup>17</sup> Application of a more symmetric standard is unlikely to allow, as the Commission alludes to, the efficiencies defense to "swallow the whole of Section 7 of the Clayton Act." A cursory read of the cases is sufficient to put to rest any concerns that the efficiencies defense is a mortal threat to agency activity under the Clayton Act. The much more pressing concern at present is whether application of

asymmetric burdens of proof in merger review will swallow the efficiencies defense.

**III. Conclusion**

There are many open and important questions with respect to the treatment of efficiencies at the Agencies. While the Agencies' analytical framework applied to diagnosing potential anticompetitive effects got an important update with the 2010 Merger Guidelines, there remains significant room for improvement with respect to the aligning agency analysis of efficiencies with standard principles of economic analysis. Primary among these important questions is whether the burden of proof required to establish cognizable efficiencies should be symmetrical to the burden the Agencies must overcome to establish anticompetitive effects. In my view, issues such as out-of-market efficiencies and the treatment of fixed costs also warrant further consideration.<sup>18</sup>

For the reasons set forth in this statement, I conclude that the harms from the transaction are small at best and, applying a symmetric standard to assessing the expected benefits and harms of a merger, the expected cognizable efficiencies are substantially greater than the expected harms. Accordingly, I believe the merger as proposed would have benefitted consumers. As such, I cannot join my

colleagues in supporting today's consent order because I do not have reason to believe the transaction violates Section 7 of the Clayton Act nor that a consent ordering divestiture is in the public interest.

[FR Doc. 2014-08951 Filed 4-18-14; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6750-01-P**

**DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES**

**Administration for Children and Families**

**Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request**

*Title:* State Plan Child Support Collection.

*OMB No.:* 0970-0017.

*Description:* The Office of Child Support Enforcement has approved a IV-D state plan for each state. Federal regulations require states to amend their state plans only when necessary to reflect new or revised federal statutes or regulations or material change in any state law, organization, policy, or IV-D agency operations. The requirement for submission of a state plan and plan amendments for the Child Support Enforcement program is found in sections 452, 454, and 466 of the Social Security Act.

*Respondents:* State IV-D Agencies.

**ANNUAL BURDEN ESTIMATES**

Instrument	Number of respondents	Number of responses per respondent	Average burden hours per response	Total burden hours
State Plan .....	54	4	0.50	108
OCSE-21-U4 .....	54	4	0.25	54

*Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours:* 162.

*Additional Information:* Copies of the proposed collection may be obtained by writing to the Administration for Children and Families, Office of

Planning, Research and Evaluation, 370 L'Enfant Promenade SW., Washington, DC 20447, Attn: ACF Reports Clearance Officer. All requests should be identified by the title of the information

collection. Email address: [infocollection@acf.hhs.gov](mailto:infocollection@acf.hhs.gov).

*OMB Comment:* OMB is required to make a decision concerning the collection of information between 30 and 60 days after publication of this

<sup>15</sup> Statement of Kenneth Heyer on Behalf of the United States Department of Justice, Antitrust Modernization Commission Hearings on the Treatment of Efficiencies in Merger Enforcement (Nov. 17, 2005), available at [http://govinfo.library.unt.edu/amc/commission\\_hearings/pdf/Statement-Heyer.pdf](http://govinfo.library.unt.edu/amc/commission_hearings/pdf/Statement-Heyer.pdf).

<sup>16</sup> In a recent study examining agency analysis of efficiencies claims, an FTC economist and attorney found significant disparities. Malcolm B. Coate & Andrew J. Heimert, Merger Efficiencies at the Federal Trade Commission: 1997-2007 (2009), available at <http://www.ftc.gov/sites/default/files/documents/reports/merger-efficiencies-federal-trade-commission-1997%E2%80%932007/0902mergerefficiencies.pdf>. Coate and Heimert find that "BE staff endorsed 27 percent of the claims

considered, while BC accepted significantly fewer (8.48 percent) of the claims considered during the studied period." The disparity also applies to rejection of efficiencies claims. The Bureau of Economics rejected 11.9 percent of the claims, while the Bureau of Competition rejected a significantly higher 31.9 percent of claims. *Id.* at 26.

<sup>17</sup> For example, Professor Crane explains that "[i]f the government and merging parties were held to the same standard of proof—preponderance of the evidence, for example—then, conceptually, harms and efficiencies would be given equal weight despite the different allocations of burdens of proof." In addition, "[i]f probabilities of harm are easier to demonstrate on an individualized basis than probabilities of efficiencies, even though in the aggregate both harms and efficiencies are similarly

likely in the relevant categories of cases, then merger policy will display a bias in favor of theories of harm even if it adopts an explicit symmetry principle." Crane, *supra* note 11, at 387-88.

<sup>18</sup> See, e.g., Jan M. Rybnicek & Joshua D. Wright, *Outside In or Inside Out?: Counting Merger Efficiencies Inside and Out of the Relevant Market*, in 2 William E. Kovacic: An Antitrust Tribute—Liber Amicorum (2014) (forthcoming), available at [http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\\_id=2411270](http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2411270); Judd E. Stone & Joshua D. Wright, *The Sound of One Hand Clapping: The 2010 Merger Guidelines and the Challenge of Judicial Adoption*, 39 Rev. Indus. Org. 145 (2011).

document in the **Federal Register**. Therefore, a comment is best assured of having its full effect if OMB receives it within 30 days of publication. Written comments and recommendations for the proposed information collection should be sent directly to the following: Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project, Fax: 202-395-7285, Email: [OIRA\\_SUBMISSION@OMB.EOP.GOV](mailto:OIRA_SUBMISSION@OMB.EOP.GOV), Attn: Desk Officer for the Administration for Children and Families.

**Robert Sargis**,  
*Reports Clearance Officer.*  
 [FR Doc. 2014-09016 Filed 4-18-14; 8:45 am]  
**BILLING CODE 4184-01-P**

**DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES**

**Administration for Children and Families**

**Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request**

*Title:* Child and Family Services Plan (CFSP), Annual Progress and Services Review (APSR), and Annual Budget Expenses Request and Estimated Expenditures (CFS-101).

*OMB No.:* 0970-0426.

*Description:* Under title IV-B, subparts 1 and 2, of the Social Security Act (the Act), States, Territories, and

Tribes are required to submit a Child and Family Services Plan (CFSP). The CFSP lays the groundwork for a system of coordinated, integrated, and culturally relevant family services for the subsequent five years (45 CFR 1357.15(a)(1)). The CFSP outlines initiatives and activities the State, Tribe or territory will carry out in administering programs and services to promote the safety, permanency, and well-being of children and families. By June 30 of each year, States, Territories, and Tribes are also required to submit an Annual Progress and Services Report (APSR) and a financial report called the CFS-101. The APSR is a Yearly report that discusses progress made by a State, Territory or Tribe in accomplishing the goals and objectives cited in its CFSP (45 CFR 1357.16(a)). The APSR contains new and updated information about service needs and organizational capacities throughout the five-year plan period. The CFS-101 has three parts. Part I is an annual budget request for the upcoming fiscal year. Part II includes a summary of planned expenditures by program area for the upcoming fiscal year, the estimated number of individuals or families to be served, and the geographical service area. Part III includes actual expenditures by program area, numbers of families and individuals served by program area, and the geographic areas served for the last complete fiscal year.

The Child and Family Services Improvement Act of 2006 amended Title IV-B, subparts 1 and 2, adding a number of requirements that affect reporting through the APSR and the CFS-101. Of particular note, the law added a provision requiring States (including Puerto Rico and the District of Columbia) to report data on caseworker visits (section 424(e) of the Act). States must provide annual data on 1) the percentage of children in foster care under the responsibility of the State who were visited on a monthly basis by the caseworker handling the case of the child; and 2) the percentage of the visits that occurred in the residence of the child. In addition, by June 30, 2008, States must set target percentages and establish strategies to meet the goal that; by October 1, 2011; at least 90 percent of the children in foster care are visited by their caseworkers on a monthly basis and that the majority of these visits occur in the residence of the child (section 424(e)(2)(A) of the Act).

*Respondents:* States, Territories, and Tribes must complete the CFSP, APSR, and CFS-101. Tribes and territories are exempted from the monthly caseworker visits reporting requirement of the APSR. There are approximately 180 Tribal entities that are eligible for IV-B funding. There are 52 States (including Puerto Rico and the District of Columbia) that must complete the CFSP, APSR, and CFS-101. There are a total of 232 possible respondents.

**ANNUAL BURDEN ESTIMATES**

Instrument	Number of respondents	Number of responses per respondent	Average burden hours per response	Total burden hours
APSR .....	232	1	76.58	17,766.56
CFSP .....	232	1	120.25	5,579.60
CFS-101, Parts I, II, and III .....	232	1	4.38	1,016.16
Caseworker Visits .....	52	1	99.33	5,165.16

*Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours:* 29,527 hours.

*Additional Information:* Copies of the proposed collection may be obtained by writing to the Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, 370 L'Enfant Promenade, SW., Washington, DC 20447, Attn: ACF Reports Clearance Officer. All requests should be identified by the title of the information collection. Email address: [infocollection@acf.hhs.gov](mailto:infocollection@acf.hhs.gov).

*OMB Comment:* OMB is required to make a decision concerning the collection of information between 30 and 60 days after publication of this document in the **Federal Register**.

Therefore, a comment is best assured of having its full effect if OMB receives it within 30 days of publication. Written comments and recommendations for the proposed information collection should be sent directly to the following: Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project, Fax: 202-395-7285, Email: [OIRA\\_SUBMISSION@OMB.EOP.GOV](mailto:OIRA_SUBMISSION@OMB.EOP.GOV), Attn: Desk Officer for the Administration for Children and Families.

**Robert Sargis**,  
*Reports Clearance Officer.*  
 [FR Doc. 2014-08959 Filed 4-18-14; 8:45 am]  
**BILLING CODE 4184-01-P**

**DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES**

**Food and Drug Administration**

[Docket No. FDA-2014-N-0373]

**Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposed Collection; Comment Request; Risk and Benefit Perception Scale Development**

**AGENCY:** Food and Drug Administration, HHS.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) is announcing an opportunity for public comment on the