

plans to open a new facility in Monterrey in 2014. The Department also recently opened application service centers in Mexicali, Piedras Negras, and Reynosa to accommodate additional applicants along the U.S.-Mexico border.

Of the three remaining comments, one noted its support for the reduced K visa fee and one applauded the Department for decreasing consular fees on certain nonimmigrant, immigrant, and special visa services, while also expressing concern for the increases to the other visa categories. One comment expressed a desire for a discount on all minor NIVs, not just minor BCCs. We note that the Department is required by law to set the fee for the minor BCC below cost at \$15. The same requirement does not apply to other minor NIVs, which the Department sets on the basis of cost as described more fully above.

Conclusion

The Department has adjusted the fees to ensure that sufficient resources are available to meet the costs of providing consular services in light of the CoSM's findings. Pursuant to OMB guidance and federal law, the Department endeavors to recover the cost of providing services that benefit specific individuals rather than the public at large. See OMB Circular A-25, sections 6(a)(1), (a)(2)(a); 31 U.S.C. 9701(b). For this reason, the Department has adjusted the Schedule.

Regulatory Findings

For a summary of the regulatory findings and analyses regarding this rulemaking, please refer to the findings and analyses published with the interim final rule, which can be found at 77 FR 18907, which are adopted herein. The rule became effective April 13, 2012. As noted above, the Department has considered the comments submitted in response to the interim final rule, and does not adopt them. Thus, the rule remains in effect without modification.

In addition, as noted in the interim final rule, this rule was submitted to and reviewed by OMB pursuant to E.O. 12866. The Department of State has also considered this rule in light of Executive Order 13563, dated January 18, 2011, and affirms that this regulation is consistent with the guidance therein.

Accordingly, the Interim Final Rule amending 22 CFR parts 22 and 42 which was published at 77 FR 18907 on March 29, 2012, is adopted as final without change.

Dated: September 4, 2012.

Patrick F. Kennedy,
Under Secretary of State for Management,
U.S. Department of State.

[FR Doc. 2012-22862 Filed 9-14-12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4710-06-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Internal Revenue Service

26 CFR Part 1

[TD 9598]

RIN 1545-BK98

Integrated Hedging Transactions of Qualifying Debt

Correction

In rule document 2012-21986 appearing on pages 54808-54811 in the issue of Thursday, September 6, 2012 make the following correction:

On page 54811, in the first column, on the eleventh line from the bottom of the page, "(i) *Expiration date*. This section expires on September 4, 2012", should read "(i) *Expiration date*. This section expires on September 4, 2015."

[FR Doc. C1-2012-21986 Filed 9-14-12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 1505-01-D

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Office of the Secretary

[Docket ID DoD-2012-OS-0102]

32 CFR Part 319

Privacy Act; Implementation

AGENCY: Defense Intelligence Agency, DoD.

ACTION: Direct final rule with request for comments.

SUMMARY: The Defense Intelligence Agency is updating the Defense Intelligence Agency Privacy Act Program, by adding the (k)(2) exemption to accurately describe the basis for exempting the records in the system of records notice LDIA 10-0002, Foreign Intelligence and Counterintelligence Operation Records. This direct final rule makes non-substantive changes to the Defense Intelligence Agency Privacy Program rules. These changes will allow the Department to exempt records from certain portions of the Privacy Act. This will improve the efficiency and effectiveness of DoD's program by ensuring the integrity of ongoing Foreign Intelligence and Counterintelligence Operations Records

related to the protection of national security, DoD personnel, facilities and equipment of the Defense Intelligence Agency and the Department of Defense.

This rule is being published as a direct final rule as the Department of Defense does not expect to receive any adverse comments, and so a proposed rule is unnecessary.

DATES: The rule will be effective on November 26, 2012 unless comments are received that would result in a contrary determination. Comments will be accepted on or before November 16, 2012. If adverse comment is received, DoD will publish a timely withdrawal of the rule in the **Federal Register**.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments, identified by docket number and title, by any of the following methods:

* *Federal Rulemaking Portal:* <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the instructions for submitting comments.

* *Mail:* Federal Docket Management System Office, 4800 Mark Center Drive, East Tower, Suite 02G09, Alexandria, VA 22350-3100.

Instructions: All submissions received must include the agency name and docket number for this **Federal Register** document. The general policy for comments and other submissions from members of the public is to make these submissions available for public viewing on the Internet at <http://www.regulations.gov> as they are received without change, including any personal identifiers or contact information.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Theresa Lowery at (202) 231-1193.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Direct Final Rule and Significant Adverse Comments

DoD has determined this rulemaking meets the criteria for a direct final rule because it involves non-substantive changes dealing with DoD's management of its Privacy Programs. DoD expects no opposition to the changes and no significant adverse comments. However, if DoD receives a significant adverse comment, the Department will withdraw this direct final rule by publishing a notice in the **Federal Register**. A significant adverse comment is one that explains: (1) Why the direct final rule is inappropriate, including challenges to the rule's underlying premise or approach; or (2) why the direct final rule will be ineffective or unacceptable without a change. In determining whether a comment necessitates withdrawal of this direct final rule, DoD will consider whether it warrants a substantive

response in a notice and comment process.

Executive Order 12866, “Regulatory Planning and Review” and Executive Order 13563, “Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review”

It has been determined that Privacy Act rules for the Department of Defense are not significant rules. The rules do not (1) Have an annual effect on the economy of \$100 million or more or adversely affect in a material way the economy; a sector of the economy; productivity; competition; jobs; the environment; public health or safety; or State, local, or tribal governments or communities; (2) Create a serious inconsistency or otherwise interfere with an action taken or planned by another Agency; (3) Materially alter the budgetary impact of entitlements, grants, user fees, or loan programs, or the rights and obligations of recipients thereof; or (4) Raise novel legal or policy issues arising out of legal mandates, the President’s priorities, or the principles set forth in these Executive orders.

Public Law 96–354, “Regulatory Flexibility Act” (5 U.S.C. Chapter 6)

It has been determined that Privacy Act rules for the Department of Defense do not have significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities because they are concerned only with the administration of Privacy Act systems of records within the Department of Defense.

Public Law 96–511, “Paperwork Reduction Act” (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35)

It has been determined that Privacy Act rules for the Department of Defense impose no additional information collection requirements on the public under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

Section 202, Public Law 104–4, “Unfunded Mandates Reform Act”

It has been determined that Privacy Act rules for the Department of Defense do not involve a Federal mandate that may result in the expenditure by State, local and tribal governments, in the aggregate, or by the private sector, of \$100 million or more and that such rulemaking will not significantly or uniquely affect small governments.

Executive Order 13132, “Federalism”

It has been determined that Privacy Act rules for the Department of Defense do not have federalism implications. The rules do not have substantial direct effects on the States, on the relationship between the National Government and the States, or on the distribution of

power and responsibilities among the various levels of government.

List of Subjects in 32 CFR Part 319

Privacy.

Accordingly, 32 CFR part 319 is amended as follows:

PART 319—DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE AGENCY PRIVACY PROGRAM

■ 1. The authority citation for 32 CFR Part 319 continues to read as follows:

Authority: Pub. L. 93–579, 88 Stat. 1896 (5 U.S.C. 552a).

■ 2. Section 319.13 is amended by adding paragraph (h) to read as follows:

§ 319.13 Specific exemptions.

* * * * *

(h) *System identifier and name:* LDIA 10–0002, Foreign Intelligence and Counterintelligence Operation Records.

(1) *Exemption:* (i) Investigatory material compiled for law enforcement purposes, other than material within the scope of subsection 5 U.S.C. 552a(j)(2), may be exempt pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(k)(2). However, if an individual is denied any right, privilege, or benefit for which he would otherwise be entitled by Federal law or for which he would otherwise be eligible, as a result of the maintenance of the information, the individual will be provided access to the information exempt to the extent that disclosure would reveal the identity of a confidential source. NOTE: When claimed, this exemption allows limited protection of investigative reports maintained in a system of records used in personnel or administrative actions.

(ii) The specific sections of 5 U.S.C. 552a from which the system is to be exempted are 5 U.S.C. 552a (c)(3) and (c)(4), (d), (e)(1), (e)(2), (e)(3), (e)(4)(G), (H), and (I), (e)(5), (f), and (g).

(2) *Authority:* 5 U.S.C. 552a(k)(2).

(3) *Reasons:* (i) From subsection (c)(3) because to grant access to an accounting of disclosures as required by the Privacy Act, including the date, nature, and purpose of each disclosure and the identity of the recipient, could alert the subject to the existence of the investigation or prospective interest by DIA or other agencies. This could seriously compromise case preparation by prematurely revealing its existence and nature; compromise or interfere with witnesses or make witnesses reluctant to cooperate; and lead to suppression, alteration, or destruction of evidence.

(ii) From subsections (c)(4), (d), and (f) because providing access to this information could result in the concealment, destruction or fabrication of evidence and jeopardize the safety

and well being of informants, witnesses and their families, and law enforcement personnel and their families. Disclosure of this information could also reveal and render ineffectual investigative techniques, sources, and methods used by this component and could result in the invasion of privacy of individuals only incidentally related to an investigation. Investigatory material is exempt to the extent that the disclosure of such material would reveal the identity of a source who furnished the information to the Government under an express promise that the identity of the source would be held in confidence, or prior to September 27, 1975 under an implied promise that the identity of the source would be held in confidence. This exemption will protect the identities of certain sources that would be otherwise unwilling to provide information to the Government. The exemption of the individual’s right of access to his/her records and the reasons therefore necessitate the exemptions of this system of records from the requirements of the other cited provisions.

(iii) From subsection (e)(1) because it is not always possible to detect the relevance or necessity of each piece of information in the early stages of an investigation. In some cases, it is only after the information is evaluated in light of other evidence that its relevance and necessity will be clear.

(iv) From subsection (e)(2) because collecting information to the fullest extent possible directly from the subject individual may or may not be practical in a criminal investigation.

(v) From subsection (e)(3) because supplying an individual with a form containing a Privacy Act Statement would tend to inhibit cooperation by many individuals involved in a criminal investigation. The effect would be somewhat adverse to established investigative methods and techniques.

(vi) From subsections (e)(4)(G), (H), and (I) because it will provide protection against notification of investigatory material which might alert a subject to the fact that an investigation of that individual is taking place, and the disclosure of which would weaken the on-going investigation, reveal investigatory techniques, and place confidential informants in jeopardy who furnished information under an express promise that the sources’ identity would be held in confidence (or prior to the effective date of the Act, under an implied promise). In addition, this system of records is exempt from the access provisions of subsection (d).

(vii) From subsection (e)(5) because the requirement that records be

maintained with attention to accuracy, relevance, timeliness, and completeness would unfairly hamper the investigative process. It is the nature of law enforcement for investigations to uncover the commission of illegal acts at diverse stages. It is frequently impossible to determine initially what information is accurate, relevant, timely, and least of all complete. With the passage of time, seemingly irrelevant or untimely information may acquire new significance as further investigation brings new details to light.

(viii) From subsection (f) because the agency's rules are inapplicable to those portions of the system that are exempt and would place the burden on the agency of either confirming or denying the existence of a record pertaining to a requesting individual might in itself provide an answer to that individual relating to an on-going investigation. The conduct of a successful investigation leading to the indictment of a criminal offender precludes the applicability of established agency rules relating to verification of record, disclosure of the record to the individual and record amendment procedures for this record system.

(ix) From subsection (g) because this system of records should be exempt to the extent that the civil remedies relate to provisions of 5 U.S.C. 552a from which this rule exempts the system.

* * * * *

Dated: September 11, 2012.

Aaron Siegel,

Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison
Officer, Department of Defense.

[FR Doc. 2012-22655 Filed 9-14-12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5001-06-P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Office of the Secretary

[Docket ID DoD-2012-OS-0104]

32 CFR Part 319

Privacy Act; Implementation

AGENCY: Defense Intelligence Agency, DoD.

ACTION: Direct final rule with request for comments.

SUMMARY: The Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA) is adding a new exemption rule for LDIA 0209, entitled "Litigation Case Files" to exempt those records that have been previously claimed for the records in another Privacy Act system of records. DIA is updating the DIA Privacy Act Program by adding the (k)(2) and (k)(5) exemptions to accurately describe the

basis for exempting the records in the system of records notice LDIA 0209, Litigation Case Files. In addition, exempt materials from other systems of records may in turn become part of the case records in this system. To the extent that copies of exempt records from those 'other' systems of records are entered into this case record, the Defense Intelligence Agency hereby claims the same exemptions for the records from those 'other' systems that are entered into this system, as claimed for the original primary systems of records, which they are a part.

This direct final rule makes non-substantive changes to the Defense Intelligence Agency Program rules. This will improve the efficiency and effectiveness of DoD's program by ensuring the integrity of the security and counterintelligence records by the Defense Intelligence Agency and the Department of Defense. This rule is being published as a direct final rule as the Department of Defense does not expect to receive any adverse comments, and so a proposed rule is unnecessary.

DATES: The rule will be effective on November 26, 2012 unless comments are received that would result in a contrary determination. Comments will be accepted on or before November 16, 2012. If adverse comment is received, DoD will publish a timely withdrawal of the rule in the **Federal Register**.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments, identified by docket number and title, by any of the following methods:

* *Federal Rulemaking Portal:* <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the instructions for submitting comments.

* *Mail:* Federal Docket Management System Office, 4800 Mark Center Drive, East Tower, Suite 02G09, Alexandria, VA 22350-3100.

Instructions: All submissions received must include the agency name and docket number for this **Federal Register** document. The general policy for comments and other submissions from members of the public is to make these submissions available for public viewing on the Internet at <http://www.regulations.gov> as they are received without change, including any personal identifiers or contact information.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Theresa Lowery at (202) 231-1193.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Direct Final Rule and Significant Adverse Comments

DoD has determined this rulemaking meets the criteria for a direct final rule because it involves nonsubstantive

changes dealing with DoD's management of its Privacy Programs. DoD expects no opposition to the changes and no significant adverse comments. However, if DoD receives a significant adverse comment, the Department will withdraw this direct final rule by publishing a notice in the **Federal Register**. A significant adverse comment is one that explains: (1) Why the direct final rule is inappropriate, including challenges to the rule's underlying premise or approach; or (2) why the direct final rule will be ineffective or unacceptable without a change. In determining whether a comment necessitates withdrawal of this direct final rule, DoD will consider whether it warrants a substantive response in a notice and comment process.

Executive Order 12866, "Regulatory Planning and Review" and Executive Order 13563, "Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review"

It has been determined that Privacy Act rules for the Department of Defense are not significant rules. The rules do not (1) Have an annual effect on the economy of \$100 million or more or adversely affect in a material way the economy; a sector of the economy; productivity; competition; jobs; the environment; public health or safety; or State, local, or tribal governments or communities; (2) Create a serious inconsistency or otherwise interfere with an action taken or planned by another Agency; (3) Materially alter the budgetary impact of entitlements, grants, user fees, or loan programs, or the rights and obligations of recipients thereof; or (4) Raise novel legal or policy issues arising out of legal mandates, the President's priorities, or the principles set forth in these Executive Orders.

Public Law 96-354, "Regulatory Flexibility Act" (5 U.S.C. Chapter 6)

It has been determined that Privacy Act rules for the Department of Defense do not have significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities because they are concerned only with the administration of Privacy Act systems of records within the Department of Defense.

Public Law 96-511, "Paperwork Reduction Act" (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35)

It has been determined that Privacy Act rules for the Department of Defense impose no additional information collection requirements on the public under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.