

proposed rule change, and noted interest in seeing the MSRB coordinate with other regulators and market participants to educate investors and other market participants about the effects of shortening the settlement cycle to T+2.<sup>33</sup> The MSRB stated that it expects to coordinate implementation of a T+2 regular-way settlement cycle for municipal securities transactions with other regulators.<sup>34</sup>

#### IV. Discussion and Commission Findings

The Commission has carefully considered the proposed rule change as well as the comments received. The Commission finds that the proposed rule change is consistent with the requirements of the Act and the rules and regulations thereunder applicable to the MSRB.

In particular, the Commission finds that the proposed rule change is consistent with Section 15B(b)(2)(C) of the Act,<sup>35</sup> which requires, among other things, that the rules of the MSRB be designed to prevent fraudulent and manipulative acts and practices, to promote just and equitable principles of trade, to foster cooperation and coordination with persons engaged in regulating, clearing, settling, processing information with respect to, and facilitating transactions in municipal securities and municipal financial products, to remove impediments to and perfect the mechanism of a free and open market in municipal securities and municipal financial products, and, in general, to protect investors, municipal entities, obligated persons, and the public interest. The Commission believes that the proposed rule change is consistent with Section 15B(b)(2)(C) of the Act because the proposed rule change is reasonably designed to remove impediments to, and perfect the mechanism of, a free and open market in municipal securities by shortening the time between trade execution and settlement by one business day. According to the MSRB, the benefits of the proposed rule change will enhance the overall efficiency of the securities markets, promote financial stability, and better align U.S. securities markets with global markets.

In approving the proposed rule change, the Commission has also considered the proposed rule change's impact on efficiency, competition, and capital formation.<sup>36</sup> The Commission does not believe that the proposed rule

change would impose any burden on competition not necessary or appropriate in furtherance of the purposes of the Act.

For the reasons noted above, the Commission believes that the proposed rule change is consistent with the Act.

#### V. Conclusion

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED, pursuant to Section 19(b)(2) of the Act,<sup>37</sup> that the proposed rule change (SR-MSRB-2016-04) be, and hereby is, approved.

For the Commission, pursuant to delegated authority.<sup>38</sup>

**Robert W. Errett,**

*Deputy Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 2016-10437 Filed 5-3-16; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 8011-01-P**

#### SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

##### Proposed Collection; 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 0-2, SEC File No. 270-572, OMB Control No. 3235-0636.

Notice is hereby given that pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501-3520), the Securities and Exchange Commission (the "Commission") has submitted to the Office of Management and Budget a request for extension of the previously approved collection of information discussed below.

Several sections of the Investment Company Act of 1940 ("Act" or "Investment Company Act")<sup>1</sup> give the Commission the authority to issue orders granting exemptions from the Act's provisions. The section that grants broadest authority is section 6(c), which provides the Commission with authority to conditionally or unconditionally exempt persons, securities or transactions from any provision of the Investment Company Act, or the rules or regulations thereunder, if and to the extent that such exemption is necessary or appropriate in the public interest and consistent with the protection of investors and the purposes fairly intended by the policy and provisions of the Act.<sup>2</sup>

Rule 0-2 under the Investment Company Act,<sup>3</sup> entitled "General Requirements of Papers and Applications," prescribes general instructions for filing an application seeking exemptive relief with the Commission for which a form is not specifically prescribed. Rule 0-2 requires that each application filed with the commission have (a) a statement of authorization to file and sign the application on behalf of the applicant, (b) a verification of application and statements of fact, (c) a brief statement of the grounds for application, and (d) the name and address of each applicant and of any person to whom questions should be directed. The Commission uses the information required by rule 0-2 to decide whether the applicant should be deemed to be entitled to the action requested by the application.

Applicants for orders can include registered investment companies, affiliated persons of registered investment companies, and issuers seeking to avoid investment company status, among other entities. Commission staff estimates that it receives approximately 184 applications per year under the Act. Although each application typically is submitted on behalf of multiple entities, the entities in the vast majority of cases are related companies and are treated as a single respondent for purposes of this analysis.

The time to prepare an application depends on the complexity and/or novelty of the issues covered by the application. We estimate that the Commission receives 25 of the most time-consuming applications annually, 125 applications of medium difficulty, and 34 of the least difficult applications. Based on conversations with applicants, we estimate that in-house counsel would spend from ten to fifty hours helping to draft and review an application. We estimate a total annual hour burden to all respondents of 5,340 hours [(50 hours × 25 applications) + (30 hours × 125 applications) + (10 hours × 34 applications)].

Much of the work of preparing an application is performed by outside counsel. The cost outside counsel charges applicants depends on the complexity of the issues covered by the application and the time required for preparation. Based on conversations with attorneys who serve as outside counsel, the cost ranges from approximately \$10,000 for preparing a well-precedented, routine application to approximately \$150,000 to prepare a complex and/or novel application. This distribution gives a total estimated

<sup>33</sup> See FSI Letter.

<sup>34</sup> See *supra* note 3.

<sup>35</sup> 15 U.S.C. 78o-4(b)(2)(C).

<sup>36</sup> 15 U.S.C. 78c(f).

<sup>37</sup> 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(2).

<sup>38</sup> 17 CFR 200.30-3(a)(12).

<sup>1</sup> 15 U.S.C. 80a-1 *et seq.*

<sup>2</sup> 15 U.S.C. 80a-6(c).

<sup>3</sup> 17 CFR 270.0-2.

annual cost burden to applicants of filing all applications of \$14,090,000 [(25 × \$150,000) + (125 × \$80,000) + (34 × \$10,000)].

These estimates of average costs are made solely for the purposes of the Paperwork Reduction Act. The estimate is not derived from a comprehensive or even a representative survey or study of the costs of Commission rules.

This collection of information is necessary to obtain a benefit and 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 OMB control number.

The public may view the background documentation for this information collection at the following Web site, [www.reginfo.gov](http://www.reginfo.gov). Comments should be directed to: (i) Desk Officer for the Securities and Exchange Commission, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, Room 10102, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20503, or by sending an email to: [ShaguftaAhmed@omb.eop.gov](mailto:ShaguftaAhmed@omb.eop.gov); and (ii) Pamela Dyson, Director/Chief Information Officer, Securities and Exchange Commission, c/o Remi Pavlik-Simon, 100 F Street NE., Washington, DC 20549 or send an email to: [PRA\\_Mailbox@sec.gov](mailto:PRA_Mailbox@sec.gov). Comments must be submitted to OMB within 30 days of this notice.

Dated: April 28, 2016.

**Robert W. Errett,**

*Deputy Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 2016-10366 Filed 5-3-16; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 8011-01-P**

## SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

### 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 7d-1, SEC File No. 270-176, OMB Control No. 3235-0311.

Notice is hereby given that, pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501-3520), the Securities and Exchange Commission (the "Commission") has submitted to the Office of Management and Budget a request for extension of the previously approved collection of information discussed below.

Section 7(d) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-

7(d)) (the "Act" or "Investment Company Act") requires an investment company ("fund") organized outside the United States ("foreign fund") to obtain an order from the Commission allowing the fund to register under the Act before making a public offering of its securities through the United States mail or any means of interstate commerce. The Commission may issue an order only if it finds that it is both legally and practically feasible effectively to enforce the provisions of the Act against the foreign fund, and that the registration of the fund is consistent with the public interest and protection of investors.

Rule 7d-1 (17 CFR 270.7d-1) under the Act, which was adopted in 1954, specifies the conditions under which a Canadian management investment company ("Canadian fund") may request an order from the Commission permitting it to register under the Act. Although rule 7d-1 by its terms applies only to Canadian funds, other foreign funds generally have agreed to comply with the requirements of rule 7d-1 as a prerequisite to receiving an order permitting the foreign fund's registration under the Act.

The rule requires a Canadian fund proposing to register under the Act to file an application with the Commission that contains various undertakings and agreements of the fund. The requirement for the Canadian fund to file an application is a collection of information under the Paperwork Reduction Act. Certain of the undertakings and agreements, in turn, impose the following additional information collection requirements:

- (1) The fund must file with the Commission agreements between the fund and its directors, officers, and service providers requiring them to comply with the fund's charter and bylaws, the Act, and certain other obligations relating to the undertakings and agreements in the application;
- (2) the fund and each of its directors, officers, and investment advisers that is not a U.S. resident, must file with the Commission an irrevocable designation of the fund's custodian in the United States as agent for service of process;
- (3) the fund's charter and bylaws must provide that (a) the fund will comply with certain provisions of the Act applicable to all funds, (b) the fund will maintain originals or copies of its books and records in the United States, and (c) the fund's contracts with its custodian, investment adviser, and principal underwriter, will contain certain terms, including a requirement that the adviser maintain originals or copies of pertinent records in the United States;
- (4) the fund's contracts with service providers will require that the provider perform the contract in accordance with the Act, the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C.

77a), and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78a), as applicable; and

(5) the fund must file, and periodically revise, a list of persons affiliated with the fund or its adviser or underwriter.

As noted above, under section 7(d) of the Act the Commission may issue an order permitting a foreign fund's registration only if the Commission finds that "by reason of special circumstances or arrangements, it is both legally and practically feasible effectively to enforce the provisions of the (Act)." The information collection requirements are necessary to assure that the substantive provisions of the Act may be enforced as a matter of contract right in the United States or Canada by the fund's shareholders or by the Commission.

Rule 7d-1 also contains certain information collection requirements that are associated with other provisions of the Act. These requirements are applicable to all registered funds and are outside the scope of this request.

The Commission believes that one foreign fund is registered under rule 7d-1 and currently active. Apart from requirements under the Act applicable to all registered funds, rule 7d-1 imposes ongoing burdens to maintain records in the United States, and to update, as necessary, certain fund agreements, designations of the fund's custodian as service agent, and the fund's list of affiliated persons. The Commission staff estimates that each year under the rule, the active registrant and its directors, officers, and service providers engage in the following collections of information and associated burden hours:

- For the fund and its investment adviser to maintain records in the United States:<sup>1</sup> 0 hours: 0 minutes of compliance clerk time.
- For the fund to update its list of affiliated persons: 2 hours: 2 hours of support staff time.
- For new officers, directors, and service providers to enter into and file agreements requiring them to comply with the fund's charter and bylaws, the Act, and certain other obligations:

<sup>1</sup> The rule requires an applicant and its investment adviser to maintain records in the United States (which, without the requirement, might be maintained in Canada or another foreign jurisdiction), which facilitates routine inspections and any special investigations of the fund by Commission staff. The registrant and its investment adviser, however, already maintain the registrant's records in the United States and in no other jurisdiction. Therefore, maintenance of the registrant's records in the United States does not impose an additional burden beyond that imposed by other provisions of the Act. Those provisions are applicable to all registered funds and the compliance burden of those provisions is outside the scope of this request.