

Comment 11: Whether the British Columbia (BC) Ban on Exports of Logs and Wood Residue Is a Countervailable Subsidy

Comment 12: Whether the BC Ban on Exports of Logs and Wood Residue Provides a Financial Contribution

Comment 13: Whether the Department Should Use Tier 1 Benchmarks in BC

Comment 14: Whether the Department Failed To Apply Its Own Evidentiary Standards on the BC Ban on Exports of Logs and Wood Residue

Comment 15: Whether the Department Needs To Conduct a Feedback Effect Analysis

Comment 16: Whether the Department Should Use a Transaction-By-Transaction Calculation Methodology for the BC Ban on Exports of Logs and Wood Residue

Comment 17: Whether the Department Should Revise the Transportation Cost for Logs Purchased in BC by Catalyst

Comment 18: Whether the Department Selected the Appropriate Log Benchmarks

Comment 19: Whether the Wood Chip Benchmark Dataset Is Distortive

Comment 20: Whether the Department Should Revise the Wood Chip Benchmark Transportation Cost

Comment 21: Whether the Department Should Revise the Transportation Cost Applied to Catalyst's Purchases of Wood Chips in BC

Comment 22: Whether the Department Should Adjust the Sawdust and Hog Fuel Calculations Based Upon Changes to the Wood Chip Benchmark

Comment 23: Whether the Government of New Brunswick Provided Stumpage to Irving for LTAR

Comment 24: Whether the Department Should Grant an Adjustment to New Brunswick (NB) Stumpage Rates

Comment 25: Whether the Department Should Use a Transaction-By-Transaction Calculation Methodology for NB Stumpage

Comment 26: Whether the Department Should Zero Comparisons That Generate Negative Benefits

Comment 27: Whether the Large Industrial Renewable Energy Purchase Program (LIREPP) Confers a Benefit on the Irving Companies

Comment 28: The Workforce Expansion Program Is Not Specific

Comment 29: The New Brunswick R&D Tax Credit Is Not Specific

Comment 30: Whether the Benefit to JDIL From the Federal Pulp and Paper Green Transformation Program (FPPGTP) Is Countervailable

Comment 31: Whether the GNB's Reimbursement of Silviculture and License Management Expenses Is Countervailable

Comment 32: Whether the Accelerated Capital Cost Allowance (ACCA) for Class 29 Assets Is Specific and Whether It Is a Tax Credit

Comment 33: Whether the Benefit Calculation for the Atlantic Investment Tax Credit (AITC) Must Be Adjusted for

the Additional Taxes That Were Paid as a Result of the Program

Comment 34: Sales Denominators for Benefits Received by Cross-Owned Input Suppliers Must Include All Sales of the Downstream Product

VII. Recommendation

[FR Doc. 2017-08211 Filed 4-21-17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

The Department of Commerce will submit to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for clearance the following proposal for collection of information under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. chapter 35).

Agency: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA).

Title: Atlantic Highly Migratory Species Voluntary Release Reports.

OMB Control Number: 0648-0628.

Form Number(s): None.

Type of Request: Regular (extension of a currently approved information collection).

Number of Respondents: 7.

Average Hours per Response: 5

minutes.

Burden Hours: 1 hour (rounded up).

Needs and Uses: This request is for an extension of a currently approved information collection.

Under the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSFMCA, 16 U.S.C. 1801 *et seq.*) the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) is to ensure that conservation and management measures promote, to the extent practicable, implementation of scientific research programs that include the tagging and releasing of Atlantic highly migratory species (HMS). The currently approved information collection allows the public to submit volunteered geographic and biological information relating to HMS releases in order to populate an interactive Web site mapping tool. This Web page attracts visitors who are interested in Atlantic HMS and contains information and links to promote HMS tagging programs that the general public can support or become involved with. All submissions are voluntary. Information is used to raise awareness for releasing Atlantic HMS and HMS tagging programs, and is not used as representative results.

Affected Public: Individuals or households; businesses or other for-

profit organizations; not-for-profit institutions; Federal government; and State, Local, or Tribal government.

Frequency: On occasion.

Respondent's Obligation: Voluntary.

This information collection request may be viewed at reginfo.gov. Follow the instructions to view Department of Commerce collections currently under review by OMB.

Written comments and recommendations for the proposed information collection should be sent within 30 days of publication of this notice to OIRA_Submission@omb.eop.gov or fax to (202) 395-5806.

Dated: April 18, 2017.

Sarah Brabson,

NOAA PRA Clearance Officer.

[FR Doc. 2017-08158 Filed 4-21-17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-22-P

COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION

Fees for Reviews of the Rule Enforcement Programs of Designated Contract Markets and Registered Futures Associations

AGENCY: Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

ACTION: Notice of 2016 schedule of fees.

SUMMARY: The Commodity Futures Trading Commission ("CFTC" or "Commission") charges fees to designated contract markets and registered futures associations to recover the costs incurred by the Commission in the operation of its program of oversight of self-regulatory organization rule enforcement programs, specifically National Futures Association ("NFA"), a registered futures association, and the designated contract markets. The calculation of the fee amounts charged for 2016 by this notice is based upon an average of actual program costs incurred during fiscal year ("FY") 2013, FY 2014, and FY 2015.

DATES: *Effective:* Each self-regulatory organization is required to remit electronically the applicable fee on or before June 23, 2017.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mary Jean Buhler, Chief Financial Officer, Commodity Futures Trading Commission; (202) 418-5089; Three Lafayette Centre, 1155 21st Street NW., Washington, DC 20581. For information on electronic payment, contact Jennifer Fleming; (202) 418-5034; Three Lafayette Centre, 1155 21st Street NW., Washington, DC 20581.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background Information

A. General

This notice relates to fees for the Commission’s review of the rule enforcement programs at the registered futures associations¹ and designated contract markets (“DCM”), each of which is a self-regulatory organization (“SRO”) regulated by the Commission. The Commission recalculates the fees charged each year to cover the costs of operating this Commission program.² The fees are set each year based on direct program costs, plus an overhead factor. The Commission calculates actual costs, then calculates an alternate fee taking volume into account, and then charges the lower of the two.³

B. Overhead Rate

The fees charged by the Commission to the SROs are designed to recover program costs, including direct labor costs and overhead. The overhead rate is calculated by dividing total Commission-wide overhead direct program labor costs into the total amount of the Commission-wide overhead pool. For this purpose, direct program labor costs are the salary costs of personnel working in all Commission programs. Overhead costs generally consist of the following Commission-wide costs: Indirect personnel costs (leave and benefits), rent,

communications, contract services, utilities, equipment, and supplies. This formula has resulted in the following overhead rates for the most recent three years (rounded to the nearest whole percent): 181 percent for FY 2013, and 180 percent for FY 2014, and 211 percent for FY 2015.

C. Conduct of SRO Rule Enforcement Reviews

Under the formula adopted by the Commission in 1993, the Commission calculates the fee to recover the costs of its rule enforcement reviews and examinations, based on the three-year average of the actual cost of performing such reviews and examinations at each SRO. The cost of operation of the Commission’s SRO oversight program varies from SRO to SRO, according to the size and complexity of each SRO’s program. The three-year averaging computation method is intended to smooth out year-to-year variations in cost. Timing of the Commission’s reviews and examinations may affect costs—a review or examination may span two fiscal years and reviews and examinations are not conducted at each SRO each year.

As noted above, adjustments to actual costs may be made to relieve the burden on an SRO with a disproportionately large share of program costs. The Commission’s formula provides for a

reduction in the assessed fee if an SRO has a smaller percentage of United States industry contract volume than its percentage of overall Commission oversight program costs. This adjustment reduces the costs so that, as a percentage of total Commission SRO oversight program costs, they are in line with the pro rata percentage for that SRO of United States industry-wide contract volume.

The calculation is made as follows: The fee required to be paid to the Commission by each DCM is equal to the lesser of actual costs based on the three-year historical average of costs for that DCM or one-half of average costs incurred by the Commission for each DCM for the most recent three years, plus a pro rata share (based on average trading volume for the most recent three years) of the aggregate of average annual costs of all DCMs for the most recent three years. The formula for calculating the second factor is: $0.5a + 0.5vt =$ current fee. In this formula, “a” equals the average annual costs, “v” equals the percentage of total volume across DCMs over the last three years, and “t” equals the average annual costs for all DCMs. NFA has no contracts traded; hence, its fee is based simply on costs for the most recent three fiscal years. This table summarizes the data used in the calculations of the resulting fee for each entity:

	Actual total costs			3-year average actual costs	3-year percent of volume	Volume adjusted costs	2016 Assessed fee
	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015				
CBOE Futures	\$235,567	\$158,209	\$131,259	1.22	\$73,074	\$73,074
Chicago Board of Trade	164,974	\$55,515	17,938	79,476	30.08	223,017	79,476
Chicago Mercantile Exchange	391,917	225,701	540,151	385,923	44.03	461,189	385,923
ELX Futures	134,267	44,756	0.00	22,378	22,378
ICE Futures U.S.	360,223	81,176	105,864	182,421	10.21	153,429	153,429
Kansas City Board of Trade	559	186	0.06	467	186
Minneapolis Grain Exchange	220,975	47,648	147,983	138,868	0.05	69,741	69,741
NADEX North American	101,252	980	34,077	0.08	17,505	17,505
New York Mercantile Exchange	135,316	225,672	118,701	159,897	13.84	164,294	159,897
NYSE LIFFE US	24,802	8,267	0.13	4,909	4,909
One Chicago	128,599	31,196	289	53,362	0.28	28,384	28,384
Subtotal	1,898,452	667,888	1,089,134	1,218,491	100	1,218,387	994,902
National Futures Association	186,499	292,102	401,337	293,312	293,312
Total	2,084,950	959,990	1,490,471	1,511,804	1,288,214

An example of how the fee is calculated for one exchange, the Chicago Board of Trade, is set forth here:

a. Actual three-year average costs equal \$79,476.

b. The alternative computation is: (.5) (\$79,476) + (.5) (.30) (\$1,218,491) = \$223,017.

c. The fee is the lesser of a or b; in this case \$79,476.

As noted above, the alternative calculation based on contracts traded is not applicable to NFA because it is not a DCM and has no contracts traded. The Commission’s average annual cost for conducting oversight review of the NFA

¹ National Futures Association is the only registered futures association.

² See section 237 of the Futures Trading Act of 1982, 7 U.S.C. 16a, and 31 U.S.C. 9701. For a broader discussion of the history of Commission fees, see 52 FR 46070, Dec. 4, 1987.

³ 58 FR 42643, Aug. 11, 1993, and 17 CFR part 1, app. B.

rule enforcement program during fiscal years 2013 through 2015 was \$293,312. The fee to be paid by the NFA for the current fiscal year is \$293,312.

II. Schedule of Fees

Fees for the Commission’s review of the rule enforcement programs at the

registered futures associations and DCMs regulated by the Commission are as follows:

	3-Year average actual cost	3-Year percent of volume	2016 Fee lesser of actual or calculated fee
CBOE Futures	\$131,259	1.22	\$73,074
Chicago Board of Trade	79,476	30.08	79,476
Chicago Mercantile Exchange	385,923	44.03	385,923
ELX Futures	44,756	0.00	22,378
ICE Futures U.S	182,421	10.21	153,429
Kansas City Board of Trade	186	0.06	186
Minneapolis Grain Exchange	138,868	0.05	69,741
NADEX North American	34,077	0.08	17,505
New York Mercantile Exchange	159,897	13.84	159,897
NYSE LIFFE US	8,267	0.13	4,909
One Chicago	53,362	0.2795	28,384
Subtotal	1,218,491	100	994,902
National Futures Association	293,312	293,312
Total	1,511,804	1,288,214

III. Payment Method

The Debt Collection Improvement Act (DCIA) requires deposits of fees owed to the government by electronic transfer of funds. See 31 U.S.C. 3720. For information about electronic payments, please contact Jennifer Fleming at (202) 418-5034 or jfleming@cftc.gov, or see the CFTC Web site at <http://www.cftc.gov>, specifically, <http://www.cftc.gov/cftc/cftcelectronicpayments.htm>.

(Authority: 7 U.S.C. 16a)

Issued in Washington, DC, on April 19, 2017, by the Commission.

Robert N. Sidman,

Deputy Secretary of the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2017-08222 Filed 4-21-17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6351-01-P

COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION

Agency Information Collection Activities: Notice of Intent To Renew Collection Number 3038-0091, Disclosure and Retention of Certain Information Relating to Cleared Swaps Customer Collateral

AGENCY: Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Commodity Futures Trading Commission (“CFTC” or “Commission”) is announcing an opportunity for public comment on the proposed renewal of a collection of certain information by the agency. Under the Paperwork Reduction Act (“PRA”), Federal agencies are required

to publish notice in the **Federal Register** concerning each proposed collection of information, including each proposed extension of an existing collection of information, and to allow 60 days for public comment. This notice solicits comments on the collections of information provided for by the Commission’s regulations under the Commodity Exchange Act (“CEA”) relating to the protection of customer collateral held by futures commission merchants (“FCM”) and derivatives clearing organizations (“DCO”) to serve as margin in cleared swaps transactions.

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before June 23, 2017.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments, identified by “Disclosure and Retention of Certain Information Relating to Cleared Swaps Customer Collateral,” and Collection Number 3038-0091 by any of the following methods:

- The Agency’s Web site, at <http://comments.cftc.gov>. Follow the instructions for submitting comments through the Web site.
- *Mail:* Christopher Kirkpatrick, Secretary of the Commission, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, Three Lafayette Centre, 1155 21st Street NW., Washington, DC 20581.
- *Hand Delivery/Courier:* Same as Mail above.
- *Federal eRulemaking Portal:* <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the instructions for submitting comments through the Portal.

Please submit your comments using only one method.

All comments must be submitted in English, or if not, accompanied by an

English translation. Comments will be posted as received to <http://www.cftc.gov>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jacob Chachkin, Special Counsel, 202-418-5496, email: jchachkin@cftc.gov; or Joshua Beale, Special Counsel, 202-418-5446, email: jbeale@cftc.gov, Division of Swap Dealer and Intermediary Oversight, Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Under the PRA,¹ Federal agencies must obtain approval from the Office of Management and Budget (“OMB”) for each collection of information they conduct or sponsor. “Collection of Information” is defined in 44 U.S.C. 3502(3) and 5 CFR 1320.3 and includes agency requests or requirements that members of the public submit reports, keep records, or provide information to a third party. Section 3506(c)(2)(A) of the PRA, 44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A), requires Federal agencies to provide a 60-day notice in the **Federal Register** concerning each proposed collection of information, including each proposed extension of an existing collection of information, before submitting the collection to OMB for approval. To comply with this requirement, the CFTC is publishing notice of the proposed collection of information listed below.

Title: Disclosure and Retention of Certain Information Relating to Cleared Swaps Customer Collateral (OMB Control No. 3038-0091). This is a request for an extension of a currently approved information collection.

¹ 44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.