

*eVS Unmanifested Fee*

Add \$0.25 for each unmanifested parcel paying commercial prices, unless the IMpb Noncompliance Fee was already assessed on that parcel.

[FR Doc. 2021-06674 Filed 3-31-21; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7710-12-C

**POSTAL SERVICE****Transfer of Bound Printed Matter Parcels to Competitive Product List**

**AGENCY:** Postal Service™.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Postal Service is providing notice that it has filed a request with the Postal Regulatory Commission to transfer Bound Printed Matter Parcels from the Market Dominant Product List to the Competitive Product List.

**DATES:** April 1, 2021.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Markes Lucius at (202) 268-6170 or Garry Rodriguez at (202) 268-7281.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** On March 26, 2021, the United States Postal Service® filed with the Postal Regulatory Commission a request to transfer Bound Printed Matter Parcels from the Market Dominant Product List to the Competitive Product List, pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 3642. Documents pertinent to this request are available at <http://www.prc.gov>, Docket No. MC2021-78.

**Ruth B. Stevenson,**

*Attorney, Federal Compliance.*

[FR Doc. 2021-06650 Filed 3-31-21; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7710-12-P

**SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION**

[SEC File No. 270-139, OMB Control No. 3235-0128]

**Submission for OMB Review; 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 12f-1

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”) has submitted to the

Office of Management and Budget (“OMB”) a request for approval of extension of the previously approved collection of information provided for in Rule 12f-1 (17 CFR 240.12f-1) under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (“Act”) (15 U.S.C. 78a *et seq.*).

Rule 12f-1 (“Rule”), originally adopted in 1979 pursuant to Sections 12(f) and 23(a) of the Act, and as further modified in 1995 and 2005, sets forth the requirements for filing an exchange application to reinstate unlisted trading privileges (“UTP”) in a security in which UTP has been suspended by the Commission pursuant to Section 12(f)(2)(A) of the Act. Under Rule 12f-1, an exchange must submit one copy of an application for reinstatement of UTP to the Commission that contains specified information, as set forth in the Rule. The application for reinstatement, pursuant to the Rule, must provide the name of the issuer, the title of the security, the name of each national securities exchange, if any, on which the security is listed or admitted to unlisted trading privileges, whether transaction information concerning the security is reported pursuant to an effective transaction reporting plan contemplated by Rule 601 of Regulation NMS, the date of the Commission’s suspension of unlisted trading privileges in the security on the exchange, and any other pertinent information related to whether the reinstatement of UTP in the subject security is consistent with the maintenance of fair and orderly markets and the protection of investors. Rule 12f-1 further requires a national securities exchange seeking to reinstate its ability to extend unlisted trading privileges in a security to indicate that it has provided a copy of such application to the issuer of the security, as well as to any other national securities exchange on which the security is listed or admitted to unlisted trading privileges.

The information required by Rule 12f-1 enables the Commission to make the necessary findings under the Act prior to granting applications to reinstate unlisted trading privileges. This information is also made available to members of the public who may wish to comment upon the applications. Without the Rule, the Commission

would be unable to fulfill these statutory responsibilities.

There are currently 24 national securities exchanges subject to Rule 12f-1. The burden of complying with Rule 12f-1 arises when a potential respondent seeks to reinstate its ability to extend unlisted trading privileges to any security for which unlisted trading privileges have been suspended by the Commission, pursuant to Section 12(f)(2)(A) of the Act. The staff estimates that each application would require approximately one hour to complete. Thus each potential respondent would incur on average one burden hour in complying with the Rule.

The Commission staff estimates that there could be as many as 24 responses annually for an aggregate annual hour burden for all respondents of approximately 24 hours (24 responses × 1 hour per response). Each respondent’s related internal cost of compliance for Rule 12f-1 would be approximately \$221.00, or, the cost of one hour of professional work of a paralegal needed to complete the application. The total annual cost of compliance for all potential respondents, therefore, is approximately \$5,304 (24 responses × \$221.00 per response).

Compliance with Rule 12f-1 is mandatory. Rule 12f-1 does not have a record retention requirement *per se*. However, responses made pursuant to Rule 12f-1 are subject to the recordkeeping requirements of Rules 17a-3 and 17a-4 of the Act. Information received in response to Rule 12f-1 shall not be kept confidential; the information collected is public information.

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.

The public may view background documentation for this information collection at the following website: [www.reginfo.gov](http://www.reginfo.gov). Find this particular information collection by selecting “Currently under 30-day Review—Open for Public Comments” or by using the search function. Written comments and recommendations for the proposed information collection should be sent within 30 days of publication of this notice to (i) [www.reginfo.gov/public/do/PRAMain](http://www.reginfo.gov/public/do/PRAMain) and (ii) David Bottom, Director/Chief Information Officer,

Securities and Exchange Commission, c/o Cynthia Roscoe, 100 F Street NE, Washington, DC 20549, or by sending an email to: [PRA\\_Mailbox@sec.gov](mailto:PRA_Mailbox@sec.gov).

Dated: March 29, 2021.

**J. Matthew DeLesDernier,**  
Assistant Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2021-06732 Filed 3-31-21; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8011-01-P

## SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34-91420; File No. SR-ISE-2021-04]

### Self-Regulatory Organizations; Nasdaq ISE, LLC; Notice of Filing and Immediate Effectiveness of Proposed Rule Change To Amend ISE's Pricing Schedule at Options 7, Section 9, Part C To Reduce the Options Regulatory Fee

March 26, 2021.

Pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 ("Act"),<sup>1</sup> and Rule 19b-4 thereunder,<sup>2</sup> notice is hereby given that on March 16, 2021, Nasdaq ISE, LLC ("ISE" or "Exchange") filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC" or "Commission") the proposed rule change as described in Items I and II, below, which Items have been prepared by the Exchange. The Commission is publishing this notice to solicit comments on the proposed rule change from interested persons.

#### I. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Terms of Substance of the Proposed Rule Change

The Exchange proposes to amend ISE's Pricing Schedule at Options 7, Section 9, Part C to reduce the Options Regulatory Fee or "ORF".

While the changes proposed herein are effective upon filing, the Exchange has designated the amendments become operative on April 1, 2021.

The text of the proposed rule change is available on the Exchange's website at <https://listingcenter.nasdaq.com/rulebook/ise/rules>, at the principal office of the Exchange, and at the Commission's Public Reference Room.

#### II. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Purpose of, and Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change

In its filing with the Commission, the Exchange 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 Exchange has prepared summaries, set forth in sections A, B, and C below, of the most significant aspects of such statements.

#### A. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Purpose of, and Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change

##### 1. Purpose

Currently, ISE assesses an ORF of \$0.0020 per contract side as specified in ISE's Pricing Schedule at Options 7, Section 9, Part C. The Exchange proposes to reduce the ORF from \$0.0020 per contract side to \$0.0018 per contract side as of April 1, 2021, in order to help ensure that revenue collected from the ORF, in combination with other regulatory fees and fines, does not exceed the Exchange's total regulatory costs.

##### Collection of ORF

Currently, ISE assesses its ORF for each customer option transaction that is either: (1) Executed by a member on ISE; or (2) cleared by an ISE member at The Options Clearing Corporation ("OCC") in the customer range,<sup>3</sup> even if the transaction was executed by a non-member of ISE, regardless of the exchange on which the transaction occurs.<sup>4</sup> If the OCC clearing member is an ISE member, ORF is assessed and collected on all cleared customer contracts (after adjustment for CMTA<sup>5</sup>); and (2) if the OCC clearing member is not an ISE member, ORF is collected only on the cleared customer contracts executed at ISE, taking into account any CMTA instructions which may result in collecting the ORF from a non-member.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>3</sup> Participants must record the appropriate account origin code on all orders at the time of entry in order. The Exchange represents that it has surveillances in place to verify that members mark orders with the correct account origin code.

<sup>4</sup> The Exchange uses reports from OCC when assessing and collecting the ORF.

<sup>5</sup> CMTA or Clearing Member Trade Assignment is a form of "give-up" whereby the position will be assigned to a specific clearing firm at OCC.

<sup>6</sup> By way of example, if Broker A, an ISE member, routes a customer order to CBOE and the transaction executes on CBOE and clears in Broker A's OCC Clearing account, ORF will be collected by ISE from Broker A's clearing account at OCC via direct debit. While this transaction was executed on a market other than ISE, it was cleared by an ISE member in the member's OCC clearing account in the customer range, therefore there is a regulatory nexus between ISE and the transaction. If Broker A was not an ISE member, then no ORF should be assessed and collected because there is no nexus; the transaction did not execute on ISE nor was it cleared by an ISE member.

In the case where a member both executes a transaction and clears the transaction, the ORF is assessed to and collected from that member. In the case where a member executes a transaction and a different member clears the transaction, the ORF is assessed to and collected from the member who clears the transaction and not the member who executes the transaction. In the case where a non-member executes a transaction at an away market and a member clears the transaction, the ORF is assessed to and collected from the member who clears the transaction. In the case where a member executes a transaction on ISE and a non-member clears the transaction, the ORF is assessed to the member that executed the transaction on ISE and collected from the non-member who cleared the transaction. In the case where a member executes a transaction at an away market and a non-member clears the transaction, the ORF is not assessed to the member who executed the transaction or collected from the non-member who cleared the transaction because the Exchange does not have access to the data to make absolutely certain that ORF should apply. Further, the data does not allow the Exchange to identify the member executing the trade at an away market.

##### ORF Revenue and Monitoring of ORF

The Exchange monitors the amount of revenue collected from the ORF to ensure that it, in combination with other regulatory fees and fines, does not exceed regulatory costs. In determining whether an expense is considered a regulatory cost, the Exchange reviews all costs and makes determinations if there is a nexus between the expense and a regulatory function. The Exchange notes that fines collected by the Exchange in connection with a disciplinary matter offset ORF.

Revenue generated from ORF, when combined with all of the Exchange's other regulatory fees and fines, is designed to recover a material portion of the regulatory costs to the Exchange of the supervision and regulation of member customer options business including performing routine surveillances, investigations, examinations, financial monitoring, and policy, rulemaking, interpretive, and enforcement activities. Regulatory costs include direct regulatory expenses and certain indirect expenses in support of the regulatory function. The direct expenses include in-house and third party service provider costs to support the day to day regulatory work such as surveillances, investigations and examinations. The indirect expenses

<sup>1</sup> 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

<sup>2</sup> 17 CFR 240.19b-4.