

Affected entities	SDRs, SEFs, DCMs, DCOs, SD/MSPs, non-SD/MSP reporting entities		
	Burden type	Burden per respondent	Number of respondents
One-time hours burden	0 hours	449	0 hours.
One-time costs	\$0	449	\$0.
Recurring hours burden	200 hours	449	89,900 hours.
Recurring costs	\$0	449	\$0.

Termination of original swaps:

Affected entities	DCOs		
	Burden type	Burden per respondent	Number of respondents
One-time hours burden	3,000 hours	12	36,000 hours.
One-time costs	\$0	12	\$0.
Recurring hours burden	0 hours	12	0 hours.
Recurring costs	\$250,000	12	\$3,000,000.

4. Request for Comment

The NPRM on cleared swap reporting requested comments on the burden associated with the added and amended PET fields, and on DCOs reporting original swap terminations.³⁰ Those comments may be found on the Commission's Web site, <http://www.cftc.gov>, at <http://www.cftc.gov/PublicComments/CommentList.aspx?id=1614>. All comments received in response to the NPRM will be considered, along with the comments received in response to this notice, in determining the Commission's submission to OMB regarding revisions to existing information collections to account for changes adopted in the Cleared Swap Reporting Release.

The Commission invites comments on:

- Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Commission, including whether the information will have a practical use;
- The accuracy of the Commission's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;
 - Ways to enhance the quality, usefulness, and clarity of the information to be collected; and
 - Ways to minimize the burden of collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology; *e.g.*, permitting electronic submission of responses.

Specifically, the Commission invites comments on the following questions:

1. The Commission has proposed including a 200 hour recurring burden in the collection to account for periodic changes to reporting systems brought about by changes to PET terms (such as those under the Cleared Swap Reporting Release) as well as other periodic changes. Does this estimate accurately estimate the burden associated with the periodic updating of reporting systems to ensure continued compliance with part 45 reporting obligations?

2. Given that not every DCO clears swaps in every asset class, and that not every SDR accepts data for every asset class, to how many SDRs must DCOs typically connect to properly report original swap terminations?

3. Can DCOs take advantage of economies of scale in terms of personnel and/or equipment when connecting to more than one SDR?

4. Given that original swap termination messages under revised § 45.4 would need to be submitted daily—not, as with creation data, as soon as technologically practicable—are DCOs able to submit original swap terminations through methods less expensive than full connections to SDRs that are used for reporting creation data and real-time reporting? If so, what are the costs associated with such connections?

5. In the Cleared Swap Reporting Release, the Commission encouraged DCOs and SDRs to standardize original swap termination messages. Are DCOs and SDRs working towards such a standardized message? What cost savings could be associated with such standardized messages?

6. Would a standardized termination message allow DCOs to use connection

methods less expensive than full connections to SDRs that are used for reporting creation data and real-time reporting?

7. As noted in footnote 23, the Commission is proposing to reduce the number of SDRs used for PRA burden calculations from 15 to four. Would this change accurately reflect the current state of the data reporting industry?

8. The Commission received comments on the hours burden associated with establishing a DCO connection to an SDR, but not a cost estimate. Do the proposed revisions to the PRA, which include an hours burden for establishing a connection, and a cost burden for maintaining a connection, accurately reflect the PRA burden on DCOs?

(Authority: 44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*)

Dated: July 15, 2016.

Robert N. Sidman,

Deputy Secretary of the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2016-17208 Filed 7-20-16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6351-01-P

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

[Docket No. CPSC-2009-0073]

Agency Information Collection Activities; Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request—Virginia Graeme Baker Pool and Spa Safety Act; Compliance Form

AGENCY: Consumer Product Safety Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the requirements of the Paperwork Reduction Act ("PRA") of 1995 (44

³⁰ See 77 FR 25320 at 25328.

U.S.C. chapter 35), the Consumer Product Safety Commission (“Commission” or “CPSC”) announces that the Commission has submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (“OMB”) a request for extension of approval of a collection of information regarding a form used to verify whether pools and spas are in compliance with the Virginia Graeme Baker Pool and Spa Safety Act. In the **Federal Register** of April 25, 2016 (81 FR 24068), the CPSC published a notice to announce the agency’s intention to seek extension of approval of the collection of information. The Commission received no comments. Therefore, by publication of this notice, the Commission announces that CPSC has submitted to the OMB a request for extension of approval of that collection of information, without change.

DATES: Written comments on this request for extension of approval of information collection requirements should be submitted by August 22, 2016.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments about this request by email: OIRA_submission@omb.eop.gov or fax: 202–395–6881. Comments by mail should be sent to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attn: OMB Desk Officer for the CPSC, Office of Management and Budget, Room 10235, 725 17th Street NW., Washington, DC 20503. In addition, written comments that are sent to OMB also should be submitted electronically at <http://www.regulations.gov>, under Docket No. CPSC–2009–0073.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For further information contact: Robert H. Squibb, Consumer Product Safety Commission, 4330 East West Highway, Bethesda, MD 20814; (301) 504–7815, or by email to: rsquibb@cpsc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: CPSC has submitted the following currently approved collection of information to OMB for extension:

Title: Virginia Graeme Baker Pool and Spa Safety Act Verification of Compliance Form.

OMB Number: 3041–0142.

Type of Review: Renewal of collection.

Frequency of Response: On occasion.

Affected Public: Public pools and spa facilities.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 200 pools or facilities.

Estimated Time per Response: 3 hours to inspect a pool or spa facility.

Total Estimated Annual Burden: The total testing burden hours are 600 (200 inspections × 3 hours per inspection).

General Description of Collection: On December 19, 2008, the Virginia Graeme Baker Pool and Spa Safety Act (“Act”) became effective (Pub. L. 110–140). The Act applies to public pools and spas and requires that each swimming pool and spa drain cover manufactured, distributed, or entered into commerce in the United States shall conform to the entrapment protection standards of the ASME/ANSI A112.19.8 performance standard or any successor standard regulating such swimming pool or drain cover pursuant to section 1404(b) of the Act.

On August 5, 2011, the Commission published a final rule incorporating by reference ANSI/APSP–16 2011 as the successor standard, effective September 6, 2011. 76 FR 47436. The Act requires that, in addition to having the anti-entrapment devices or systems, each public pool and spa in the United States with a single main drain other than an unblockable drain shall be equipped with one or more of the following devices or systems designed to prevent entrapment by pool or spa drains including a safety vacuum release system, suction-limiting vent system, gravity drainage system, automatic pump shut-off system or drain disablement. CPSC will collect information through the verification of compliance form to identify drain covers, pools, and spas that do not meet the performance requirements in ANSI/APSP–16 2011 and the Act.

Dated: July 18, 2016.

Todd A. Stevenson,
Secretary, Consumer Product Safety Commission.

[FR Doc. 2016–17215 Filed 7–20–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6355–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Applications for New Awards; Technical Assistance and Dissemination to Improve Services and Results for Children With Disabilities and Technical Assistance on State Data Collection—National Technical Assistance Center to Increase the Participation and Improve the Performance of Students with Disabilities on State and Districtwide Assessments

AGENCY: Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education.

ACTION: Notice.

Overview Information:
Technical Assistance and Dissemination to Improve Services and Results for Children with Disabilities

and Technical Assistance on State Data Collection—National Technical Assistance Center to Increase the Participation and Improve the Performance of Students with Disabilities on State and Districtwide Assessments.

Notice inviting applications for a new award for fiscal year (FY) 2016.

Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) Number: 84.326G.

DATES: *Applications Available:* July 21, 2016.

Deadline for Transmittal of Applications: August 22, 2016.

Full Text of Announcement

I. Funding Opportunity Description

Purpose of Programs: The purpose of the Technical Assistance and Dissemination to Improve Services and Results for Children with Disabilities program is to promote academic achievement and to improve results for children with disabilities by providing technical assistance (TA), supporting model demonstration projects, disseminating useful information, and implementing activities that are supported by scientifically based research. The purpose of the Technical Assistance on State Data Collection program is to improve the capacity of States to meet the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) data collection and reporting requirements.

Priorities: This notice contains two absolute priorities. In accordance with 34 CFR 75.105(b)(2)(v), Absolute Priority 1 is from allowable activities specified or otherwise authorized in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (see sections 663 and 681(d) of the IDEA, 20 U.S.C. 1463 and 1481(d)). Absolute Priority 2 is from the notice of final priorities and requirements for the Technical Assistance on State Data Collection program (NFP) published elsewhere in this issue of the **Federal Register**.

Absolute Priorities: These priorities are absolute priorities. Under 34 CFR 75.105(c)(3), we consider only applications that meet these priorities.

These priorities are:

Absolute Priority 1—Technical Assistance and Dissemination to Improve Services and Results for Children with Disabilities—National Technical Assistance Center to Increase the Participation and Improve the Performance of Students with Disabilities on State and Districtwide Assessments.

Background:

The purpose of this priority is to fund a cooperative agreement to establish and