

to negotiated service agreement(s). The request(s) may propose the addition or removal of a negotiated service agreement from the market dominant or the competitive product list, or the modification of an existing product currently appearing on the market dominant or the competitive product list.

Section II identifies the docket number(s) associated with each Postal Service request, the title of each Postal Service request, the request's acceptance date, and the authority cited by the Postal Service for each request. For each request, the Commission appoints an officer of the Commission to represent the interests of the general public in the proceeding, pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 505 (Public Representative). Section II also establishes comment deadline(s) pertaining to each request.

The public portions of the Postal Service's request(s) can be accessed via the Commission's Web site (<http://www.prc.gov>). Non-public portions of the Postal Service's request(s), if any, can be accessed through compliance with the requirements of 39 CFR 3007.40.

The Commission invites comments on whether the Postal Service's request(s) in the captioned docket(s) are consistent with the policies of title 39. For request(s) that the Postal Service states concern market dominant product(s), applicable statutory and regulatory requirements include 39 U.S.C. 3622, 39 U.S.C. 3642, 39 CFR part 3010, and 39 CFR part 3020, subpart B. For request(s) that the Postal Service states concern competitive product(s), applicable statutory and regulatory requirements include 39 U.S.C. 3632, 39 U.S.C. 3633, 39 U.S.C. 3642, 39 CFR part 3015, and 39 CFR part 3020, subpart B. Comment deadline(s) for each request appear in section II.

II. Docketed Proceeding(s)

1. *Docket No(s)*.: CP2014–85; *Filing Title*: Notice of United States Postal Service of Change in Prices Pursuant to Amendment to Priority Mail Contract 95; *Filing Acceptance Date*: December 13, 2016; *Filing Authority*: 39 CFR 3015.5; *Public Representative*: Jennaca D. Upperman; *Comments Due*: December 21, 2016.

2. *Docket No(s)*.: CP2017–70; *Filing Title*: Notice of United States Postal Service of Filing a Functionally Equivalent Global Expedited Package Services 7 Negotiated Service Agreement and Application for Non-Public Treatment of Materials Filed Under Seal; *Filing Acceptance Date*: December 13, 2016; *Filing Authority*: 39 CFR 3015.5; *Public Representative*: Max

E. Schnidman; *Comments Due*: December 21, 2016.

3. *Docket No(s)*.: MC2017–45 and CP2017–71; *Filing Title*: Request of the United States Postal Service to Add Priority Mail Contract 270 to Competitive Product List and Notice of Filing (Under Seal) of Unredacted Governors' Decision, Contract, and Supporting Data; *Filing Acceptance Date*: December 13, 2016; *Filing Authority*: 39 U.S.C. 3642 and 39 CFR 3020.30 *et seq.*; *Public Representative*: Gregory Stanton; *Comments Due*: December 21, 2016.

4. *Docket No(s)*.: MC2017–46 and CP2017–72; *Filing Title*: Request of the United States Postal Service to Add Priority Mail Contract 271 to Competitive Product List and Notice of Filing (Under Seal) of Unredacted Governors' Decision, Contract, and Supporting Data; *Filing Acceptance Date*: December 13, 2016; *Filing Authority*: 39 U.S.C. 3642 and 39 CFR 3020.30 *et seq.*; *Public Representative*: Gregory Stanton; *Comments Due*: December 21, 2016.

5. *Docket No(s)*.: MC2017–47 and CP2017–73; *Filing Title*: Request of the United States Postal Service to Add Priority Mail Contract 272 to Competitive Product List and Notice of Filing (Under Seal) of Unredacted Governors' Decision, Contract, and Supporting Data; *Filing Acceptance Date*: December 13, 2016; *Filing Authority*: 39 U.S.C. 3642 and 39 CFR 3020.30 *et seq.*; *Public Representative*: Christopher C. Mohr; *Comments Due*: December 22, 2016.

6. *Docket No(s)*.: MC2017–48 and CP2017–74; *Filing Title*: Request of the United States Postal Service to Add Priority Mail & First-Class Package Service Contract 41 to Competitive Product List and Notice of Filing (Under Seal) of Unredacted Governors' Decision, Contract, and Supporting Data; *Filing Acceptance Date*: December 13, 2016; *Filing Authority*: 39 U.S.C. 3642 and 39 CFR 3020.30 *et seq.*; *Public Representative*: Christopher C. Mohr; *Comments Due*: December 22, 2016.

This notice will be published in the Federal Register.

Stacy L. Ruble,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2016–30417 Filed 12–16–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7710–FW–P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Proposed Collection; Comment Request

Upon Written Request, Copies Available From: Securities and Exchange Commission, Office of FOIA Services, 100 F Street NE., Washington, DC 20549–2736.

Extension:

Rule 103, SEC File No. 270–410, OMB Control No. 3235–0466.

Notice is hereby given that pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (“PRA”) (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*), the Securities and Exchange Commission (“Commission”) is soliciting comments on the existing collection of information provided for in Rule 103 of Regulation M (17 CFR 242.103), under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78a *et seq.*). The Commission plans to submit this existing collection of information to the Office of Management and Budget (“OMB”) for extension and approval.

Rule 103—Nasdaq Passive Market Making—permits passive market-making in Nasdaq securities during a distribution. A distribution participant that seeks use of this exception would be required to disclose to third parties its intention to engage in passive market making.

There are approximately 309 respondents per year that require an aggregate total of 309 hours to comply with this rule. Each respondent makes an estimated 1 annual response. Each response takes approximately 1 hour to complete. Thus, the total compliance burden per year is 309 burden hours. The total estimated internal labor cost of compliance for the respondents is approximately \$20,085.00 per year, resulting in an estimated internal labor cost of compliance per response of approximately \$65.00 (*i.e.*, \$20,085.00/309 responses).

Written comments are invited on: (a) 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; (b) the accuracy of the Commission's estimates of the burden of the proposed collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology. Consideration will be given to comments and suggestions submitted in

writing within 60 days of this publication.

An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information under the PRA unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number.

Please direct your written comments to: Pamela Dyson, Director/Chief Information Officer, Securities and Exchange Commission, c/o Remi Pavlik-Simon, 100 F Street NE., Washington, DC 20549 or send an email to: PRA_Mailbox@sec.gov.

Dated: December 6, 2016.

Brent J. Fields,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2016-30372 Filed 12-16-16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8011-01-P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34-79535; File No. SR-FICC-2016-008]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; Fixed Income Clearing Corporation; Notice of Filing and Immediate Effectiveness of a Proposed Rule Change To Modify the MBSD Schedule of Charges Dealer Account Group

December 13, 2016.

Pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (“Act”),¹ and Rule 19b-4 thereunder,² notice is hereby given that on December 2, 2016, Fixed Income Clearing Corporation (“FICC”) filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (“Commission”) the proposed rule change as described in Items I, II and III below, which Items have been prepared by the clearing agency. The Commission is publishing this notice to solicit comments on the proposed rule change from interested persons.

I. Clearing Agency’s Statement of the Terms of Substance of the Proposed Rule Change

The proposed rule change consists of an amendment to the Mortgage-Backed Securities Division (“MBSD”) Clearing Rules (the “MBSD Rules”) to include an additional fee in the “Schedule of Charges Dealer Account Group,” as described in greater detail below.³ The proposed fee would be implemented as of January 1, 2017.

¹ 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

² 17 CFR 240.19b-4.

³ Capitalized terms used herein and not otherwise defined shall have the meaning assigned to such terms in the MBSD Rules, available at <http://www.dtcc.com/legal/rules-and-procedures>.

II. Clearing Agency’s Statement of the Purpose of, and Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change

In its filing with the Commission, the clearing agency included statements concerning the purpose of and basis for the proposed rule change and discussed any comments it received on the proposed rule change. The text of these statements may be examined at the places specified in Item IV below. The clearing agency has prepared summaries, set forth in sections A, B, and C below, of the most significant aspects of such statements.

(A) Clearing Agency’s Statement of the Purpose of, and Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change

1. Purpose

FICC is proposing to amend the MBSD “Schedule of Charges Dealer Account Group” to include an additional fee. The proposed rule change would allow FICC to pass through any daylight overdraft (“DOD”) fees that MBSD incurs from The Bank of New York Mellon (“BNY”) in connection with the settlement of Clearing Members’ securities obligations. FICC would pass through these BNY DOD fees to Clearing Members who settle their securities obligations at BNY.⁴

In October 2016, FICC began to incur the cost of the BNY DOD fees. FICC is proposing to amend the MBSD “Schedule of Charges Dealer Account Group” to allow FICC to pass through the BNY DOD fees to Clearing Members who settle their securities obligations at BNY.⁵ Specifically, each Clearing Member who settles securities obligations at BNY would be charged a pass-through fee, calculated as a percentage of the total of all such costs incurred by MBSD. This percentage would be calculated on a monthly basis as follows:

(Total dollar value of Pool Deliver Obligations and Pool Receive Obligations of such Clearing Member at BNY)

(Total dollar value of Pool Deliver Obligations and Pool Receive Obligations in all Dealer Accounts at BNY)

⁴ This proposed rule change would be consistent with the fee schedule in FICC’s Government Securities Division Rulebook, available at <http://www.dtcc.com/legal/rules-and-procedures>.

⁵ The proposed fee would not be applicable to Brokers because Brokers do not have securities settlement obligations.

2. Statutory Basis

Section 17A(b)(3)(D) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended (“Act”) requires, in part, that the rules of the clearing agency provide for the equitable allocation of reasonable dues, fees and other charges among its participants.⁶ The proposed rule change would allow FICC to recover the costs of providing securities settlement services to Clearing Members by passing the BNY DOD fees incurred by MBSD to Clearing Members who settle their securities obligations at BNY. FICC believes that the proposed rule change is consistent with the requirements of the Act and the rules and regulations thereunder applicable to FICC, in particular Section 17A(b)(3)(D), because the proposed fee would be allocated among all Clearing Members who settle their securities obligations at BNY, calculated as a percentage of the total of such costs incurred by MBSD in connection with the services that FICC provide provides for such Clearing Members.⁷

(B) Clearing Agency’s Statement on Burden on Competition

FICC believes that the proposed rule change could have an impact on competition because the proposed rule change would impose an additional fee on Clearing Members who settle their securities obligations at BNY. FICC believes, however, that any burden on competition that would be created by the proposed rule change would be necessary and appropriate in furtherance of the Act. Specifically, the proposed rule change is necessary to allow FICC to recover the cost of providing services to Clearing Members by passing through the BNY DOD fees to Clearing Members who settle their securities obligations at BNY. The proposed rule change is appropriate because, as stated, it would only apply to Clearing Members who settle their securities obligations at BNY, which is the third party that is charging the fees being incurred by MBSD to provide FICC’s services.

(C) Clearing Agency’s Statement on Comments on the Proposed Rule Change Received From Members, Participants, or Others

Written comments related to the proposed rule change have not been solicited or received. FICC will notify the Commission of any written comments received by FICC.

⁶ 15 U.S.C. 78q-1(b)(3)(D).

⁷ *Id.*