cooperation of foreign authorities to maintain certain services or operations.

The FDIC would welcome comments on whether a subsidiarization requirement would facilitate the resolution of a SIFI under the MPOE or SPOE strategies, or under the Bankruptcy Code. The FDIC would also welcome comments that address the potential advantages and disadvantages for resolvability of a SIFI of a requirement that SIFIs conduct their foreign operations through subsidiaries and whether a subsidiarization requirement for foreign operations would reduce the likelihood of ring fencing and improve the resolvability of a SIFI. Additionally, would a subsidiarization requirement work to limit the spread of contagion across jurisdictions in a financial crisis, and what are the potential costs (financial and operational) of requiring subsidiarization?

The FDIC would also welcome comments on the impact a branch structure might have on a banking organization’s ability to withstand adverse economic conditions that do not threaten the viability of the group, for example, by enabling the organization to transfer funds from healthy affiliates to others that suffer losses in a manner that is consistent with 23A and 23B of the Federal Reserve Act.11 In addition, the FDIC requests comments on the extent to which a branch model might provide flexibility to manage liquidity and credit risks globally and whether funding costs for these institutions might be lower under the branch structure.

Cross-Border Cooperation

Cross-border cooperation and coordination with foreign regulatory authorities are a priority for the successful execution of the SPOE strategy. The FDIC continues to work with our foreign counterparts and has made significant progress in the last three years. The FDIC has had extensive engagement with authorities in the United Kingdom and has issued a joint paper with the Bank of England describing our common strategic approach to systemic resolution. Working relationships have also been developed with authorities in other countries, including Switzerland, Germany and Japan. The FDIC has established a joint working group on resolution and deposit insurance issues with the European Commission and continues to work with the Financial Stability Board and its Resolution Steering Group.

An important example of cross-border coordination on resolution issues is a joint letter the FDIC, the Bank of England, Bundesanstalt für Finanzdienstleistungsaufsicht (BaFin) and the Swiss Financial Market Supervisory Authority (FINMA) sent to the International Swaps and Derivatives Association (ISDA) on November 5, 2013. The letter calls for standardizing ISDA documentation to provide for a short-term suspension of early termination rights and other remedies with respect to derivatives transactions following the commencement of insolvency or resolution proceedings or exercise of a resolution power with respect to a counterparty or its specified entity, guarantor, or credit support facility.

The FDIC welcomes comment on the most important additional steps that can be taken with foreign regulatory authorities to achieve a successful resolution using the SPOE strategy.

Additional Questions

In addition to the issues highlighted above, comments are solicited on the following:

Securities-for-Claims Exchange. This Notice describes how NewCo (or NewCos) would be capitalized by converting the debt of the top-tier holding company into NewCo (or NewCos) equity. Are there particular creditors or groups of creditors for whom the securities-for-claims exchange strategy would present a particular difficulty or be unreasonably burdensome?

Valuation. This Notice describes how the assets of the bridge financial company would be valued and how uncertainty regarding such valuation could be addressed. Would the issuance to creditors of contingent value securities, such as warrants, be an effective tool to accommodate inevitable uncertainties in valuation? What characteristics—such as, term or option pricing, among others—would be useful in structuring such securities, and what is an appropriate methodology to determine these characteristics?

Information. This Notice recognizes the importance of financial reporting to the resolution process. What information, reports or disclosures by the bridge financial company are most important to claimants, the public, or other stakeholders? What additional information or explanation about the administration-claims process would be useful in addition to the information already provided by regulation or this Notice?

Effectiveness of the SPOE Strategy. This Notice describes factors that would form the basis of the initial determination as to whether the SPOE strategy would be effective for a particular covered financial company. Are there additional factors that should be considered? Is there an alternative to the SPOE strategy that would, in general, provide better results considering the goals of mitigating systemic risk to the financial system and ensuring that taxpayers would not be called upon to bail out the company?

Dated at Washington, DC, this 10th day of December, 2013.

By order of the Board of Directors.

Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

Robert E. Feldman,
Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2013–30057 Filed 12–17–13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6741–01–P

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

Notice of Agreements Filed

The Commission hereby gives notice of the filing of the following agreements under the Shipping Act of 1984. Interested parties may submit comments on the agreements to the Secretary, Federal Maritime Commission, Washington, DC 20573, within ten days of the date this notice appears in the Federal Register. Copies of the agreements are available through the Commission’s Web site (www.fmc.gov) or by contacting the Office of Agreements at (202)–523–5793 or tradeanalysis@fmc.gov.

Agreement No.: 011707–012.
Title: Gulf/South America Discussion Agreement.
Parties: BBC Chartering & Logistic GmbH & Co. KG; Industrial Maritime Carriers LLC; Seaboard Marine, Ltd.
Synopsis: The amendment clarifies that BBC Chartering Carriers GmbH & Co. KG (BBC Carriers) and BBC Chartering & Logistic GmbH & Co. KG (BBC Logistic), both common carrier members of BBC Chartering Group, are to be treated as a single party to the agreement.

Agreement No.: 012067–010.
Title: U. S. Supplemental Agreement to HLC Agreement.
Parties: BBC Chartering & Logistics GmbH & Co. KG; Beluga Chartering GmbH; Chipolbrok; Clipper Project Ltd.; Hyundai Merchant Marine Co., Ltd.; Industrial Maritime Carriers, L.L.C.;
Nordana Line A/S; and Rickmers-Linie GmbH & Cie. KG.


Synopsis: The amendment clarifies that BBC Chartering Carriers GmbH & Co. KG (BBC Carriers) and BBC Chartering & Logistic GmbH & Co. KG (BBC Logistic), both common carrier members of BBC Chartering Group, are to be treated as a single party to the agreement.

Agreement No.: 012237.
Title: Liberty Global Logistics LLC/ Hapag-Lloyd USA, LLC Cooperative Working Agreement.

Parties: Liberty Global Logistics LLC and Hapag-Lloyd USA, LLC.

Filing Parties: Marc J. Fink, Esq.; Cozen O’Connor; 1627 I Street NW., Suite 1100; Washington, DC 20006.

Synopsis: The agreement authorizes the parties to charter space to and from one another in the trade between ports on the U.S. East and Gulf Coasts on the one hand, and ports in Europe, ports on the Baltic, Arabian and Red Seas, ports on the Persian Gulf, and ports in the Middle East, India, and Pakistan, on the other hand.

By Order of the Federal Maritime Commission.
Dated: December 13, 2013.
Karen V. Gregory, Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

[OMB Control No. 9000–0161; Docket No. 2013–0077; Sequence No. 12]

Federal Acquisition Regulation; Submission for OMB Review; Reporting Purchases From Sources Outside the United States

AGENCY: Department of Defense (DoD), General Services Administration (GSA), and National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA).

ACTION: Notice of request for public comments regarding an extension, with changes, to an existing OMB clearance.

SUMMARY: Under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35), the Regulatory Secretariat will be submitting to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) a request to review and approve an extension of a currently approved information collection requirement concerning reporting purchases from sources outside the United States. A notice was published in the Federal Register at 78 FR 56230, on September 12, 2013. No comments were received.

DATES: Submit comments on or before January 17, 2014.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments identified by Information Collection 9000–0161, Reporting Purchases from Sources Outside the United States, by any of the following methods:
• Regulations.gov: http://www.regulations.gov. Submit comments via the Federal eRulemaking portal by searching for “9000–0161: Reporting of Purchases from Outside the United States”. Select the link “Submit a Comment” that corresponds with “9000–0161: Reporting of Purchases from Outside the United States”. Follow the instructions provided at the “Submit a Comment” screen. Please include your name, company name (if any), and 9000–0161; Reporting of Purchases from Outside the United States” on your attached document.
• Fax: 202–501–4067.
• Mail: General Services Administration, Regulatory Secretariat (MVCB), 1800 F Street NW., 2nd floor, Washington, DC 20405–0001. ATTN: Hada Flowers/IC 9000–0161.

Instructions: Please submit comments only and cite IC 9000–0161, in all correspondence related to this case. All comments received will be posted without change to http://www.regulations.gov, including any personal and/or business confidential information provided.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Cecelia L. Davis, Program Analyst, at 202–219–0202. For information pertaining to status or publication schedules, contact the Regulatory Secretariat at 202–501–4755.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

A. Purpose

The information on place of manufacture was formerly used by each Federal agency to prepare a report to Congress required by 41 U.S.C. 8302(b)(1) for Fiscal Year 2009 through 2011 on acquisitions of articles, materials, or supplies that are manufactured outside the United States. However, the data is still necessary for analysis of the application of the Buy American statute and the trade agreements and for other reports to Congress. Additionally, contracting officers require this data as the basis for entry into the Federal Procurement Data System for further data on the rationale for purchasing foreign manufactured items.

B. Annual Reporting Burden

Respondents ........................................ 170,822
Responses per respondent per year ........................................ 10

Total annual responses ........................................ 1,708,220
Hours per response ........................................ 0.01

Total response burden hours ........................................ 17,082

Obtaining Copies of Proposals: Requesters may obtain a copy of the information collection documents from the General Services Administration, Regulatory Secretariat (MVCB), 1800 F...