

the instant contracts are functionally equivalent to previously submitted GEPS contracts, and are supported by Governors' Decision No. 08-7, attached to the Notice and originally filed in Docket No. CP2008-4. *Id.* at 1, Attachment 3. The Notice explains that Order No. 86, which established GEPS 1 as a product, also authorized functionally equivalent agreements to be included within the product, provided that they meet the requirements of 39 U.S.C. 3633. *Id.* at 2. In Order No. 290, the Commission approved the GEPS 2 product.<sup>2</sup> In Order No. 503, the Commission approved the GEPS 3 product. Additionally, the Postal Service requested to have the contract in Docket No. CP2010-71 serve as the baseline contract for future functional equivalence analyses of the GEPS 3 product.

*The instant contracts.* The Postal Service filed the instant contracts pursuant to 39 CFR 3015.5. In addition, the Postal Service contends that each contract is in accordance with Order No. 86. The Postal Service that relates that two of the instant contracts, which expire September 30, 2010, are successor contracts for the same customers as in Docket Nos. CP2009-64 and CP2009-65, respectively. The term of each contract is 1 year from the date the Postal Service notifies the customer that all necessary regulatory approvals have been received. Notice at 3-4.

In support of its Notice, the Postal Service filed four attachments as follows:

- Attachments 1A through 1K—redacted copies of the 11 contracts and applicable annexes;
- Attachments 2A through 2K—certified statements required by 39 CFR 3015.5(c)(2) for each contract;
- Attachment 3—a redacted copy of Governors' Decision No. 08-7 which establishes prices and classifications for GEPS contracts, a description of applicable GEPS contracts, formulas for prices, an analysis of the formulas, and certification of the Governors' vote; and
- Attachment 4—an application for non-public treatment of materials to maintain redacted portions of the contracts and supporting documents under seal.

The Notice advances reasons why the instant GEPS 3 contracts fit within the Mail Classification Schedule language for GEPS. The Postal Service identifies customer-specific information and general contract terms that distinguish

<sup>2</sup> Docket No. CP2009-50, Order Granting Clarification and Adding Global Expedited Package Services 2 to the Competitive Product List, August 28, 2009 (Order No. 290).

the instant contracts from the baseline GEPS 3 agreement. *Id.* at 5. It states that the differences, which include price variations based on updated costing information and volume commitments, do not alter the contracts' functional equivalency. *Id.* at 4-5. The Postal Service asserts that "[b]ecause the agreements incorporate the same cost attributes and methodology, the relevant characteristics of these 11 GEPS contracts are similar, if not the same, as the relevant characteristics of previously filed contracts." *Id.* at 5.

The Postal Service concludes that its filings demonstrate that each of the new GEPS 3 contracts complies with the requirements of 39 U.S.C. 3633 and is functionally equivalent to the baseline GEPS 3 contract. Therefore, it requests that the instant contracts be included within the GEPS 3 product. *Id.* at 6.

## II. Notice of Filing

The Commission establishes Docket Nos. CP2010-105 through CP2010-115 for consideration of matters related to the contracts identified in the Postal Service's Notice.

These dockets are addressed on a consolidated basis for purposes of this order. Filings with respect to a particular contract should be filed in that docket.

Interested persons may submit comments on whether the Postal Service's contracts are consistent with the policies of 39 U.S.C. 3632, 3633, or 3642. Comments are due no later than September 20, 2010. The public portions of these filings can be accessed via the Commission's Web site (<http://www.prc.gov>).

The Commission appoints Paul L. Harrington to serve as Public Representative in the captioned proceedings.

## III. Ordering Paragraphs

*It is ordered:*

1. The Commission establishes Docket Nos. CP2010-105 through CP2010-115 for consideration of matters raised by the Postal Service's Notice.

2. Comments by interested persons in these proceedings are due no later than September 20, 2010.

3. Pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 505, Paul L. Harrington is appointed to serve as the officer of the Commission (Public Representative) to represent the interests of the general public in these proceedings.

4. The Secretary shall arrange for publication of this order in the **Federal Register**.

By the Commission.

**Shoshana M. Grove,**  
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 2010-23404 Filed 9-17-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7710-FW-S

## POSTAL REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. RM2010-12; Order No. 534]

### Periodic Reporting Proposals

**AGENCY:** Postal Regulatory Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice

**SUMMARY:** The Postal Service has requested changes in six analytical methods approved for use in periodic reporting. This document summarizes the proposals and invites public comment.

**DATES:** Comments are due October 8, 2010.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Stephen L. Sharfman, General Counsel, [stephen.sharfman@prc.gov](mailto:stephen.sharfman@prc.gov) or 202-789-6820.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** On September 8, 2010, the Postal Service filed a petition pursuant to 39 CFR 3050.11 to initiate an informal rulemaking proceeding to consider changes in the analytical methods approved for use in periodic reporting.<sup>1</sup> Six separate proposals are included in the Petition labeled as Proposals Three through Eight.

Proposal Three involves City Carrier costs. The Postal Service asserts that the City Carrier Cost System is capturing more detailed information regarding direct bundles. The proposal would incorporate this new information by assigning relevant costs for direct bundles to the products that utilize them.

Proposal Four would change the way certain In-Office Cost System (IOCS) acceptance costs are allocated. The change would apply to mailpieces accepted at a window, which bear non-retail indicia, and host an extra service other than Registered Mail.<sup>2</sup> Currently, acceptance costs are assigned to the extra service. The Postal Service proposes to modify this methodology by assigning acceptance costs to the host mailpiece.

Proposal Five involves utilizing the more detailed information now being captured by the Rural Carrier Cost System regarding collected prepaid

<sup>1</sup> Petition of the United States Postal Service Requesting Initiation of a Proceeding to Consider Proposed Changes in Analytic Principles (Proposals Three-Eight), September 8, 2010 (Petition).

<sup>2</sup> The extra services include Certified, Insured, Return Receipt, Delivery Confirmation, and COD.

parcels. The new information allows the recognition of a distinction between collected prepaid parcels weighing less than or equal to 2 pounds, and those greater than 2 pounds.

Proposal Six involves the International Cost and Revenue Analysis (ICRA). The Postal Service considers this proposal a change in calculation procedure, not an analytical methodology change. The change would separately incorporate the Inbound Processing and Carrier In-Office costs for Canada, Developing Countries and Industrialized Countries into the ICRA model using IOCS. The Postal Service asserts that this incorporates the Commission's methodology for using IOCS tally analysis into the ICRA model.

Proposal Seven would introduce a mailflow-based model of mail processing costs for Standard Mail Parcels and NFMs (Not-Flat Machinables). The Postal Service previously did not have a cost model for mail processing for this product.

Proposal Eight involves the distribution key for distributing empty equipment transportation costs to products. These costs are included in cost segment 14 (purchased transportation). The proposal is to attribute the empty equipment costs to products using a distribution factor that is based on the aggregate pound miles traveled on modes of transportation sampled by the Transportation Cost System (TRACS).

The attachments to the Postal Service's Petition explain each proposal in more detail, including its objective, background, impact, and an empirical example (comparing the changes in data reporting to the status quo). The Petition, including the attachments, is available for review on the Commission's Web site, <http://www.prc.gov>.

Comments on Proposals Three through Eight are due no later than October 8, 2010.

Pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 505, Cassie D'Souza is appointed as Public Representative to represent the interests of the general public concerning Proposals Three through Six and Eight; and John P. Klingenberg is appointed as Public Representative to represent the interests of the general public concerning Proposal Seven.

*It is ordered:*

1. The Petition of the United States Postal Service Requesting Initiation of a Proceeding to Consider Proposed Changes in Analytic Principles (Proposals Three—Eight), filed September 8, 2010, is granted.

2. The Commission establishes Docket No. RM2010–12 to consider the matters raised by the Postal Service's Petition.

3. Interested persons may submit comments on Proposals Three through Eight no later than October 8, 2010.

4. The Commission will determine the need for reply comments after review of the initial comments.

5. As noted in the body of this order, Cassie D'Souza and John P. Klingenberg are appointed to serve as the Public Representative to represent the interests of the general public in this proceeding.

6. The Secretary shall arrange for publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**.

By the Commission.

**Shoshana M. Grove,**

*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 2010–23371 Filed 9–17–10; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7710–FW–S**

---

## SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

### Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

*Upon Written Request, Copies Available*

*From:* Securities and Exchange Commission, Office of Investor Education and Advocacy, Washington, DC 20549–0213.

*Extension:*

Form N–SAR, SEC File No. 270–292, OMB Control No. 3235–0330.

Notice is hereby given that, pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*), the Securities and Exchange Commission (the “Commission”) is soliciting comments on the collection of information summarized below. The Commission plans to submit this existing collection of information to the Office of Management and Budget (“OMB”) for extension and approval.

Form N–SAR (OMB Control No. 3235–0330, 17 CFR 249.330) is the form used by all registered investment companies with the exception of face amount certificate companies, to comply with the periodic filing and disclosure requirements imposed by Section 30 of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a–1 *et seq.*) (“Investment Company Act”), and of rules 30a–1 and 30b1–1 thereunder (17 CFR 270.30a–1 and 17 CFR 270.30b1–1). The information required to be filed with the Commission assures the public availability of the information and permits verification of compliance with Investment Company Act requirements. Registered unit investment trusts are required to provide this information on

an annual report filed with the Commission on Form N–SAR pursuant to rule 30a–1 under the Investment Company Act, and registered management investment companies must submit the required information on a semi-annual report on Form N–SAR pursuant to rule 30b1–1 under the Investment Company Act.

The Commission estimates that the total number of respondents is 3,480 and the total annual number of responses is 6,180 ((2,700 management investment company respondents × 2 responses per year) + (780 unit investment trust respondents × 1 response per year)). The Commission estimates that each registrant filing a report on Form N–SAR would spend, on average, approximately 14.31 hours in preparing and filing reports on Form N–SAR and that the total hour burden for all filings on Form N–SAR would be 88,436 hours.

The collection of information under Form N–SAR is mandatory. Responses to the collection of information will not be kept confidential. An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid control number.

Please direct general comments regarding the above information to the following persons: (i) Desk Officer for the Securities and Exchange Commission, Office of Management and Budget, Room 10102, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20503 or send an e-mail to Shagufta Ahmed at [Shagufta\\_Ahmed@omb.eop.gov](mailto:Shagufta_Ahmed@omb.eop.gov); and (ii) Charles Boucher, Director/CIO, Securities and Exchange Commission, C/O Remi Pavlik-Simon, 6432 General Green Way, Alexandria, VA 22312; or send an e-mail to [PRA\\_Mailbox@sec.gov](mailto:PRA_Mailbox@sec.gov). Comments must be submitted to OMB within 30 days of this notice.

Dated: September 13, 2010.

**Florence E. Harmon,**

*Deputy Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 2010–23409 Filed 9–17–10; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 8010–01–P**

---

## SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

### Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

*Upon Written Request, Copies Available*

*From:* Securities and Exchange Commission, Office of Investor Education and Advocacy, Washington, DC 20549–0213.

*Extension:*