

\$0.36 + \$5 = \$5.36). The \$5 increase in copayment in this *Example 7* is less than the amount calculated pursuant to paragraph (g)(1)(iv)(A) of this section of \$5.36. Thus, the \$5 increase in copayment does not cause the plan to cease to be a grandfathered health plan.

Example 8. (i) Facts. On March 23, 2010, a self-insured group health plan provides two tiers of coverage—self-only and family. The employer contributes 80% of the total cost of coverage for self-only and 60% of the total cost of coverage for family. Subsequently, the employer reduces the contribution to 50% for family coverage, but keeps the same contribution rate for self-only coverage.

(ii) *Conclusion.* In this *Example 8*, the decrease of 10 percentage points for family coverage in the contribution rate based on cost of coverage causes the plan to cease to be a grandfathered health plan. The fact that the contribution rate for self-only coverage remains the same does not change the result.

Example 9. (i) Facts. On March 23, 2010, a self-insured grandfathered health plan has a COBRA premium for the 2010 plan year of \$5,000 for self-only coverage and \$12,000 for family coverage. The required employee contribution for the coverage is \$1,000 for self-only coverage and \$4,000 for family coverage. Thus, the contribution rate based on cost of coverage for 2010 is 80% $((5,000 - 1,000)/5,000)$ for self-only coverage and 67% $((12,000 - 4,000)/12,000)$ for family coverage. For a subsequent plan year, the COBRA premium is \$6,000 for self-only coverage and \$15,000 for family coverage. The employee contributions for that plan year are \$1,200 for self-only coverage and \$5,000 for family coverage. Thus, the contribution rate based on cost of coverage is 80% $((6,000 - 1,200)/6,000)$ for self-only coverage and 67% $((15,000 - 5,000)/15,000)$ for family coverage.

(ii) *Conclusion.* In this *Example 9*, because there is no change in the contribution rate based on cost of coverage, the plan retains its status as a grandfathered health plan. The result would be the same if all or part of the employee contribution was made pre-tax through a cafeteria plan under section 125 of the Internal Revenue Code.

Example 10. (i) Facts. A group health plan not maintained pursuant to a collective bargaining agreement offers three benefit packages on March 23, 2010. Option *F* is a self-insured option. Options *G* and *H* are insured options. Beginning July 1, 2013, the plan

increases coinsurance under Option *H* from 10% to 15%.

(ii) *Conclusion.* In this *Example 10*, the coverage under Option *H* is not grandfathered health plan coverage as of July 1, 2013, consistent with the rule in paragraph (g)(1)(ii) of this section. Whether the coverage under Options *F* and *G* is grandfathered health plan coverage is determined separately under the rules of this paragraph (g).

Example 11. (i) Facts. A group health plan that is a grandfathered health plan and also a high deductible health plan within the meaning of section 223(c)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code had a \$2,400 deductible for family coverage on March 23, 2010. The plan is subsequently amended after June 15, 2021 to increase the deductible limit by the amount that is necessary to comply with the requirements for a plan to qualify as a high deductible health plan under section 223(c)(2)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code, but that exceeds the maximum percentage increase.

(ii) *Conclusion.* In this *Example 11*, the increase in the deductible at that time does not cause the plan to cease to be a grandfathered health plan because the increase was necessary for the plan to continue to satisfy the definition of a high deductible health plan under section 223(c)(2)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code.

[FR Doc. 2020-27498 Filed 12-11-20; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

PENSION BENEFIT GUARANTY CORPORATION

29 CFR Part 4044

Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing Benefits

AGENCY: Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This final rule amends the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation's regulation on Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans to prescribe interest assumptions under the asset allocation regulation for plans with valuation dates in the first quarter of 2021. These interest assumptions are used for valuing benefits under terminating single-employer plans and for other purposes.

DATES: Effective January 1, 2021.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Gregory Katz (katz.gregory@pbgc.gov), Attorney, Regulatory Affairs Division, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, 1200 K Street NW, Washington, DC

20005, 202-229-3829. (TTY users may call the Federal relay service toll free at 1-800-877-8339 and ask to be connected to 202-229-3829.)

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: PBGC's regulation on Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans (29 CFR part 4044) prescribes actuarial assumptions—including interest assumptions—for valuing benefits under terminating single-employer plans covered by title IV of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (ERISA). The interest assumptions in the regulation are also published on PBGC's website (<https://www.pbgc.gov>).

PBGC uses the interest assumptions in appendix B to part 4044 ("Interest Rates Used to Value Benefits") to determine the present value of annuities in an involuntary or distress termination of a single-employer plan under the asset allocation regulation. The assumptions are also used to determine the value of multiemployer plan benefits and certain assets when a plan terminates by mass withdrawal in accordance with PBGC's regulation on Duties of Plan Sponsor Following Mass Withdrawal (29 CFR part 4281).

The first quarter 2021 interest assumptions will be 1.69 percent for the first 20 years following the valuation date and 1.66 percent thereafter. In comparison with the interest assumptions in effect for the fourth quarter of 2020, these interest assumptions represent no change in the select period (the period during which the select rate (the initial rate) applies), an increase of 0.07 percent in the select rate, and an increase of 0.26 percent in the ultimate rate (the final rate).

Need for Immediate Guidance

PBGC has determined that notice of, and public comment on, this rule are impracticable, unnecessary, and contrary to the public interest. PBGC routinely updates the interest assumptions in appendix B of the asset allocation regulation each quarter so that they are available to value benefits. Accordingly, PBGC finds that the public interest is best served by issuing this rule expeditiously, without an opportunity for notice and comment, and that good cause exists for making the assumptions set forth in this amendment effective less than 30 days after publication to allow the use of the proper assumptions to estimate the value of plan benefits for plans with valuation dates early in the first quarter of 2021.

PBGC has determined that this action is not a "significant regulatory action" under the criteria set forth in Executive Order 12866.

Because no general notice of proposed rulemaking is required for this amendment, the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 does not apply. See 5 U.S.C. 601(2).

List of Subjects in 29 CFR Part 4044

Employee benefit plans, Pension insurance, Pensions.

In consideration of the foregoing, 29 CFR part 4044 is amended as follows:

PART 4044—ALLOCATION OF ASSETS IN SINGLE-EMPLOYER PLANS

■ 1. The authority citation for part 4044 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 29 U.S.C. 1301(a), 1302(b)(3), 1341, 1344, 1362.

■ 2. In appendix B to part 4044, add an entry for “January–March 2021” at the end of the table to read as follows:

Appendix B to Part 4044—Interest Rates Used to Value Benefits

* * * * *

| For valuation dates occurring in the month— | The values of i_t are: | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-----------|--------|-----------|-------|-----------|
| | i_t | for $t =$ | i_t | for $t =$ | i_t | for $t =$ |
| January–March 2021 | 0.0169 | 1–20 | 0.0166 | >20 | N/A | N/A |

Issued in Washington, DC, by:
Hilary Duke,
Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation.
 [FR Doc. 2020–27377 Filed 12–14–20; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 7709–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Patent and Trademark Office

37 CFR Part 2

[Docket No. PTO–T–2019–0027]

RIN 0651–AD42

Trademark Fee Adjustment

AGENCY: United States Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce.

ACTION: Final rule; delay of effective date.

SUMMARY: On November 17, 2020, the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) published in the **Federal Register** a final rule on setting and adjusting trademark fees that is scheduled to go into effect on January 2, 2021. This final rule changes the effective date of one fee paid by international applicants under the Madrid Protocol from January 2, 2021, to February 18, 2021.

DATES: The effective date of 37 CFR 2.6(a)(1)(ii), amended at 85 FR 73197, November 17, 2020, is delayed from January 2, 2021, to February 18, 2021.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Catherine Cain, Office of the Deputy Commissioner for Trademark Examination Policy, at 571–272–8946, or by email at TMPolicy@uspto.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The USPTO published a final rule (85 FR 73197, Nov. 17, 2020) that set or adjusted certain trademark fees, as

authorized by the Leahy-Smith America Invents Act, as amended by the Study of Underrepresented Classes Chasing Engineering and Science Success Act of 2018. Those fee changes allow the USPTO to continue to recover the prospective aggregate costs of strategic and operational trademark and Trademark Trial and Appeal Board goals (based on workload projections included in the USPTO fiscal year 2021 Congressional Justification), including associated administrative costs, and to further USPTO strategic objectives by better aligning fees with costs, protecting the integrity of the trademark register, improving the efficiency of agency processes, and ensuring financial sustainability to facilitate effective trademark operations.

Among the changes in the November 17, 2020 final rule, the USPTO amended the fee at 37 CFR 2.6(a)(1)(ii) addressing applications under section 66(a) of the Trademark Act, 15 U.S.C. 1141f. This fee, paid by international applicants designating the United States under the World Intellectual Property Organization’s (WIPO) Protocol Relating to the Madrid Agreement Concerning the International Registration of Marks (Madrid Protocol), is set to increase from \$400 to \$500.

This final rule delays the effective date of the change to § 2.6(a)(1)(ii) because the treaty requires three months advance notice to WIPO, which then alerts international applicants, before an increase in the amount of the international application/subsequent designation fee can enter into force. On November 18, 2020, the USPTO provided WIPO with the required notice of the change to § 2.6(a)(1)(ii). Thus, the effective date of § 2.6(a)(1)(ii) is delayed from January 2, 2021, to February 18, 2021, three months following the notification.

Rulemaking Requirements

A. Administrative Procedure Act: This final rule revises the effective date of § 2.6(a)(1)(ii). This action relates to the setting or adjusting of trademark fees and is a rule of agency practice and procedure and/or an interpretive rule pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(A). See *JEM Broad. Co. v. F.C.C.*, 22 F.3d 32 (D.C. Cir. 1994) (“[T]he ‘critical feature’ of the procedural exception [in 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(A)] ‘is that it covers agency actions that do not themselves alter the rights or interests of parties, although [they] may alter the manner in which the parties present themselves or their viewpoints to the agency.’” (quoting *Batterton v. Marshall*, 648 F.2d 694, 707 (D.C. Cir. 1980))); see also *Bachow Commc’ns Inc. v. F.C.C.*, 237 F.3d 683, 690 (D.C. Cir. 2001) (rules governing an application process are procedural under the Administrative Procedure Act); *Inova Alexandria Hosp. v. Shalala*, 244 F.3d 342, 350 (4th Cir. 2001) (rules for handling appeals were procedural where they did not change the substantive standard for reviewing claims). Accordingly, prior notice and opportunity for public comment are not required pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 553(b) or (c) (or any other law). See *Cooper Techs. Co. v. Dudas*, 536 F.3d 1330, 1336–37 (Fed. Cir. 2008) (stating that 5 U.S.C. 553, and thus 35 U.S.C. 2(b)(2)(B), do not require notice and comment rulemaking for “interpretative rules, general statements of policy, or rules of agency organization, procedure, or practice” (quoting 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(A)).

Moreover, the Director of the USPTO, pursuant to authority at 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(B) and (d)(1), finds good cause to adopt the change in this final rule without prior notice and an opportunity for public comment or a 30-day delay in effectiveness, as such procedures would be impracticable and contrary to the public interest. Immediate implementation of the change to the