the Commission approved the functionally equivalent Singapore Post and Australia Post Agreements, respectively.5

Canada Post 2012 Agreement. The Postal Service and Canada Post, the postal operator for Canada, are parties to the Agreement. The Agreement covers, inter alia, the delivery of inbound Letter Post, in the form of letters, flats, small packets, parcels, bags, and International Registered Mail service for Letter Post. The planned inbound market dominant rates are scheduled to become effective January 7, 2012. Notice at 3. The Agreement has a term of 2 years commencing January 1, 2012 and ending December 31, 2013, although it may be extended for a third year. Id. Attachment 2 at 7–8; see also pdf version at 57 (2012–2013 CPC–USPS Contractual Bilateral Agreement, Exhibit 4).6 The Agreement however, may be terminated by either party without cause on no less than 90 days’ written notice. Id. Attachment 2 at 8.

Requirements under part 3010. The Postal Service states that the projected financial performance of the Canada Post 2012 Agreement is provided in the Excel file included with its filing. It contends that improvements should enhance mail efficiency and other functions for Letter Post items under the Agreement. Notice at 3–4.

The Postal Service asserts that the Agreement should not cause unreasonable harm in the marketplace since it is unaware of any significant competition in this market. Id. at 5–6.

Data collection plan. Under 39 CFR 3010.43, the Postal Service is required to submit a data collection plan. The Postal Service indicates that it intends to report information on this Agreement through its Annual Compliance Report. While indicating its willingness to provide information on mailflows within the annual compliance review process, the Postal Service proposes that no special data collection plan be established for this Agreement. With respect to performance measurement, it requests that the Commission exempt the Canada Post 2012 Agreement from separate reporting requirements under negotiable service agreements.

9 CFR 3055.3(a)(13) as determined in previous agreements approved as functionally equivalent agreements under the Inbound Market Dominant Multi-Service Agreements with Foreign Postal Operators 1 product.7

The Postal Service advances reasons why the instant Agreement is functionally equivalent to the previously filed CPG Agreement, TNT Agreement, HongKong Post Agreement, and China Post 2011 Agreement.8 It contends that it contains the same attributes and methodology and fits within the Mail Classification Schedule language for the Inbound Multi-Service Agreements with the Foreign Postal Operators 1 product. Additionally, it states that the Canada Post 2012 Agreement includes similar terms and conditions, e.g., is with a foreign postal operator, conforms to a common description, and relates to rates for Letter Post tendered from the postal operator’s territory. Id. at 8.

The Postal Service identifies specific differences that distinguish the instant Agreement from the previous agreements. It states that the Agreement provides greater specificity in the terms and products because of the parties’ business experience with their previous bilateral agreements. The Postal Service states differences include specific performance-based financial incentives and adjustments to the financial model based on the specific negotiations between the parties. Id. at 9–10. The Postal Service contends that the instant Agreement is nonetheless functionally equivalent to existing agreements. Id. at 11.

In its Notice, the Postal Service maintains that certain portions of the Agreement, prices, and related financial information should remain under seal. Id. at 11; id. Attachment 1.

The Postal Service concludes that the Canada Post 2012 Agreement should be added as a functionally equivalent agreement under the Inbound Market Dominant Multi-Service Agreements with Foreign Postal Operators 1 product. Id. at 12.

II. Notice of Filings

Interested persons may submit comments on whether the Postal Service’s filing in the captioned docket is consistent with the policies of


The Commission appoints James F. Callow to serve as Public Representative in this docket.

III. Ordering Paragraphs

It is ordered:

1. The Commission establishes Docket No. R2012–5 to consider matters raised by the Postal Service’s Notice.

2. Pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 505, James F. Callow is appointed to serve as officer of the Commission (Public Representative) to represent the interests of the general public in this proceeding.

3. Comments by interested persons in this proceeding are due no later than December 14, 2011.

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

By the Commission.

Shoshana M. Grove,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2011–31208 Filed 12–5–11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7710–FW–P

POSTAL REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. A2012–64; Order No. 1006]

Post Office Closing

AGENCY: Postal Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This document informs the public that an appeal of the closing of the Little America, Wyoming post office has been filed. It identifies preliminary steps and provides a procedural schedule. Publication of this document will allow the Postal Service, petitioners, and others to take appropriate action.

DATES: November 29, 2011: Administrative record due (from Postal Service); December 27, 2011, 4:30 p.m., Eastern Time: Deadline for notices to intervene. See the Procedural Schedule in the SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION section for other dates of interest.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments electronically by accessing the “Filing Online” link in the banner at the top of the Commission’s Web site (http://www.prc.gov) or by directly accessing the Commission’s Filing Online system at https://www.prc.gov/prc-pages/filing-online/login.aspx. Commenters who cannot submit their views electronically should contact the person identified in


6 When it files an executed copy of the Agreement, the Postal Service should confirm the effective dates of the Agreement.

7 In Order No. 996, the Commission held that “[f]uture agreements that fall within the parameters of the Inbound Market-Dominant Multi-Service Agreements with Foreign Postal Operators 1 product are excepted from the performance reporting requirements.” Order No. 996 at 7.

The Postal Service specifically references the differences between the instant Agreement and the TNT Agreement for comparison purposes. Id. at 8–11.
the FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT section as the source for case-related information for advice on alternatives to electronic filing.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:
Stephen L. Sharfman, General Counsel, at (202) 789–6820 (case-related information) or DocketAdmins@prc.gov (electronic filing assistance).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Notice is hereby given that, pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 404(d), on November 14, 2011, the Commission received a petition for review of the Postal Service’s determination to close the Little America post office in Little America, Wyoming. The petition for review was filed by Byron Wall (Petitioner) and is postmarked November 3, 2011. The Commission hereby institutes a proceeding under 39 U.S.C. 404(d)(5) and establishes Docket No. A2012–64 to consider Petitioner’s appeal. If Petitioner would like to further explain his position with supplemental information or facts, Petitioner may either file a Participant Statement on PRC Form 61 or file a brief with the Commission no later than December 19, 2011.

Categories of issues apparently raised.
Petitioner contends that (1) The Postal Service failed to consider the effect of the closing on the community (see 39 U.S.C. 404(d)(2)(A)(i)); (2) the Postal Service failed to consider whether or not it will continue to provide a maximum degree of effective and regular postal services to the community (see 39 U.S.C. 404(d)(2)(A)(iii)); (3) the Postal Service failed to adequately consider the economic savings resulting from the closure (see 39 U.S.C. 404(d)(2)(A)(iv)); and (4) the Postal Service failed to follow procedures required by law regarding closures (see 39 U.S.C. 404(d)(5)(B)).

After the Postal Service files the administrative record and the Commission reviews it, the Commission may find that there are more legal issues than those set forth above, or that the Postal Service’s determination dispose of one or more of those issues. The deadline for the Postal Service to file the applicable administrative record is within 15 days after the date on which the petition for review was filed with the Commission. See 39 CFR 3001.113. In addition, the due date for any responsive pleading by the Postal Service is also within 15 days after the date in which the petition for review was filed with the Commission.

Availability: Web site posting. The Commission has posted the appeal and supporting material on its Web site at http://www.prc.gov. Additional filings in this case and participant’s submissions also will be posted on the Web site, if provided in electronic format or amenable to conversion, and not subject to a valid protective order.

Information on how to use the Commission’s Web site is available online or by contacting the Commission’s webmaster via telephone at (202) 789–6873 or via electronic mail at prc-webmaster@prc.gov.

The appeal and all related documents are also available for public inspection in the Commission’s docket section. Docket section hours are 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Eastern Time, Monday through Friday, except on Federal government holidays. Docket section personnel may be contacted via electronic mail at prc-dockets@prc.gov or via telephone at (202) 789–6846.

Filing of documents. All filings of documents in this case shall be made using the Internet (Filing Online) pursuant to Commission rules 9(a) and 10(a) at the Commission’s Web site, http://www.prc.gov, unless a waiver is obtained. See 39 CFR 3001.9(a) and 3001.10(a). Instructions for obtaining an account to file documents online may be found on the Commission’s Web site, http://www.prc.gov, or by contacting the Commission’s docket section at prc-dockets@prc.gov or via telephone at (202) 789–6846.

Commission reserves the right to redact personal information which may infringe on an individual’s privacy rights from documents filed in this proceeding.

Intervention. Persons, other than the Petitioners and respondents, wishing to be heard in this matter are directed to file a notice of intervention. See 39 CFR 3001.111(b). Notices of intervention in this case are to be filed on or before December 27, 2011. A notice of intervention shall be filed using the Internet (Filing Online) at the Commission’s Web site, http://www.prc.gov, unless a waiver is obtained for hardcopy filing. See 39 CFR 3001.9(a) and 3001.10(a).

Further procedures. By statute, the Commission is required to issue its decision within 120 days from the date it receives the appeal. See 39 U.S.C. 404(d)(5). A procedural schedule has been developed to accommodate this statutory deadline. In the interest of expeditious determination, in light of the 120-day decision schedule, the Commission may request the Postal Service or other participants to submit information or memoranda of law on any appropriate issue. As required by Commission rules, if any motions are filed, responses are due 7 days after any such motion is filed. See 39 CFR 3001.21.

It is ordered:
1. The procedural schedule listed below is hereby adopted.
2. Pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 505, Natalie Rea Ward is designated officer of the Commission (Public Representative) to represent the interests of the general public.
3. The Secretary shall arrange for publication of this notice and order and Procedural Schedule in the Federal Register.

By the Commission.
Shoshana M. Grove, Secretary.

PROCEDURAL SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 14, 2011</td>
<td>Notice of Appeal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 29, 2011</td>
<td>Deadline for the Postal Service to file the applicable administrative record in this appeal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 29, 2011</td>
<td>Deadline for the Postal Service to file any responsive pleading.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 27, 2011</td>
<td>Deadline for notices to intervene (see 39 CFR 3001.111(b)).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 19, 2011</td>
<td>Deadline for Petitioners’ Form 61 or initial brief in support of petition (see 39 CFR 3001.115(a) and (b)).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 9, 2012</td>
<td>Deadline for answering brief in support of the Postal Service (see 39 CFR 3001.115(c)).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 24, 2012</td>
<td>Deadline for reply briefs in response to answering briefs (see 39 CFR 3001.115(d)).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 31, 2012</td>
<td>Deadline for motions by any party requesting oral argument; the Commission will schedule oral argument only when it is a necessary addition to the written filings (see 39 CFR 3001.116).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2, 2012</td>
<td>Expiration of the Commission’s 120-day decisional schedule (see 39 U.S.C. 404(d)(5)).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Sunshine Act Meeting

Notice is hereby given, pursuant to the provisions of the Government in the Sunshine Act, Public Law 94–409, that the Securities and Exchange Commission will hold a Closed Meeting on Wednesday, December 7, 2011 at 9:30 a.m.

Commissioners, Counsel to the Commissioners, the Secretary to the Commission, and recording secretaries will attend the Closed Meeting. Certain staff members who have an interest in the matters also may be present.

The General Counsel of the Commission, or his designee, has certified that, in his opinion, one or more of the exemptions set forth in 5 U.S.C. 552b(c)(10) and 17 CFR 200.402(a)(10), permit consideration of the scheduled matter at the Closed Meeting.

Commissioner Walter, as duty officer, voted to consider the item listed for the Closed Meeting in closed session, and determined that no earlier notice thereof was possible.

The subject matter of the Closed Meeting scheduled for Wednesday, December 7, 2011 will be:

A matter relating to enforcement proceedings.

At times, changes in Commission priorities require alterations in the scheduling of meeting items.

For further information and to ascertain what, if any, matters have been added, deleted or postponed, please contact:

The Office of the Secretary at (202) 551–5400.

Dated: December 2, 2011.

Kevin M. O’Neill,
Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2011–31210 Filed 12–5–11; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 7710–FW–P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION


Self-Regulatory Organizations; The NASDAQ Stock Market LLC; Notice of Filing and Immediate Effectiveness of Proposed Rule Change To Eliminate Exchange Direct Orders

November 30, 2011.

Pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (“Act”),1 and Rule 19b–42 thereunder, notice is hereby given that on November 22, 2011, The NASDAQ Stock Market LLC (the “Exchange” or “NASDAQ”) 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

NASDAQ is filing with the Securities and Exchange Commission (“Commission”) a proposal for the NASDAQ Options Market (“NOM”) to eliminate Exchange Direct Orders. Specifically, NASDAQ proposes to delete Chapter VI, Section 1(e)(7) and Section 6(a)(2), to delete Exchange Direct Orders from its rules. The Exchange proposes to eliminate this order type, effective November 30, 2011, as explained further below.

The text of the proposed rule change is available at http://nasdaq.cchwallstreet.com/, at NASDAQ’s principal office, 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

The purpose of the proposed rule change is to eliminate Exchange Direct Orders due to the new requirements of the recently adopted Market Access Rule.3 Exchange Direct Orders, defined in Chapter VI, Section 1(e)(7), are orders that are directed to an exchange other than NOM as directed by the entering party without checking the NOM book. If unexecuted, the order (or unexecuted portion thereof) shall be returned to the entering party. This order type may only be used for orders with time-in-force parameters of IOC. NASDAQ proposes to delete this definition as well as a reference to Exchange Direct Orders in Chapter VI, Section 6(a)(2).

In adopting the Exchange Direct Order type, NASDAQ explained that Exchange Direct Orders are routed by its affiliate, NASDAQ Options Services LLC (“NOS”). NOS is a broker-dealer and member of NASDAQ as well as other exchanges.4 The specific functions of NOS, as a facility of NASDAQ and its affiliates, have been approved by the Commission. On November 30, 2011, certain requirements of the Market Access Rule (Rule 15c3–3 under the Act)5 become operative, such that broker-dealers like NOS become subject to those provisions. Specifically, the Commission extended the deadline for compliance with Rule 15c3–5(c)(1)(i),6 which requires the implementation of risk management controls and supervisory procedures that are reasonably designed to prevent the entry of orders that exceed appropriate pre-set credit or capital thresholds, because the type of controls required by the Rule are not currently in place at many broker-dealers, and developing and implementing appropriate controls in this area can be a complex exercise. NASDAQ and NOS have determined that the adoption of these controls and procedures exceeds the scope of NOS’ current functions and, therefore, NOS would cease accepting Exchange Direct Orders, because the acceptance of those

---

4 17 CFR 240.15c3–5.