agency may not conduct or sponsor, and that a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number.

The NRC published a **Federal Register** notice with a 60-day comment period on this information collection on December 11, 2018 (83 FR 63687).

1. *The title of the information collection:* Request for Information Pursuant to 10 CFR 50.54(f) Regarding Recommendations 2.1, 2.3 and 9.3, of the Near Term Task Force Review of Insights from the Fukushima Dai-ichi event.

2. *OMB approval number:* 3150–0211.

3. *Type of submission:* Extension.

4. *The form number if applicable:* Not applicable.

5. How often the collection is required or requested: Once.

6. Who will be required or asked to respond: 12 power reactor licensees.

7. *The estimated number of annual responses:* 4 (12 power reactors will each respond once over the course of the three-year clearance period).

8. *The estimated number of annual respondents:* 4 (12 power reactors will each respond once over the course of the three-year clearance period).

9. *An estimate of the total number of hours needed annually to comply with the information collection requirement or request:* 11,000 hours.

10. *Abstract:* Following events at the Fukushima Dai-ichi nuclear power plant resulting from the March 11, 2011, earthquake and subsequent tsunami, and in response to requirements contained in section 402 of the Consolidated Appropriations Act (Pub. L. 112–074), the NRC requested information from power reactor licensees pursuant to title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* part 50.54(f). The information requested includes seismic risk assessments. The NRC will use the information provided by licensees to determine if additional regulatory action is necessary. Licensees will have already completed submittals in response to this 50.54(f) request for seismic and flooding walkdown reports, seismic hazard reevaluations, seismic risk assessment, seismic high and low frequency confirmations, seismic spent fuel pool evaluations, flooding hazard reevaluations, flooding integrated assessments, focused evaluations of local intense precipitation and available physical margin, communications analyses, and initial and final staffing analyses.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, on March 26, 2019.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

David C. Cullison,

NRC Clearance Officer, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 2019–06157 Filed 3–29–19; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee; Cancellation of Upcoming Meeting

AGENCY: Office of Personnel Management.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee is issuing this notice to cancel the April 18, 2019, public meeting scheduled to be held in Room 5A06A, Office of Personnel Management Building, 1900 E Street NW, Washington, DC. The original **Federal Register** notice announcing this meeting was published Friday, November 16, 2018, at 83 FR 57754.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Madeline Gonzalez, 202–606–2838, or email *pay-leave-policy@opm.gov.*

Office of Personnel Management.

Alexys Stanley,

Regulatory Affairs Analyst.

[FR Doc. 2019–06173 Filed 3–29–19; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6325–39–P

POSTAL SERVICE

Temporary Emergency Committee of the Board of Governors; Sunshine Act Meeting

DATES AND TIMES: Tuesday, April 9, 2019, at 10:00 a.m.

PLACE: Washington, DC.

STATUS: Closed.

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED: Tuesday, April 9, 2019, at 10:00 a.m.

1. Strategic Issues.
2. Financial Matters.
3. Compensation and Personnel Matters.
4. Executive Session—Discussion of prior agenda items and Board governance.

GENERAL COUNSEL CERTIFICATION: The General Counsel of the United States Postal Service has certified that the meeting may be closed under the Government in the Sunshine Act.

CONTACT PERSON FOR MORE INFORMATION: Michael J. Elston, Acting Secretary of the Board, U.S. Postal Service, 475 L'Enfant Plaza SW, Washington, DC 20260–1000. Telephone: (202) 268–4800.

Michael J. Elston,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2019–06407 Filed 3–28–19; 4:15 pm]

BILLING CODE 7710–12–P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Investment Advisers Act Release No. 5213/ File No. 803–00245]

Generation Investment Management US LLP and Generation Investment Management LLP

March 26, 2019.

AGENCY: Securities and Exchange Commission (''Commission'').

ACTION: Notice.

Notice of application for an exemptive order under Section 206A of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (the ''Act'') and rule 206(4)–5(e) under the Act.

APPLICANTS: Generation Investment Management US LLP (''Generation US'') and Generation Investment Management LLP (''Generation UK'') (collectively, ''Generation,'' ''Applicants'' or ''Advisers'').

SUMMARY OF APPLICATION: Applicants request that the Commission issue an order under Section 206A of the Act and rule 206(4)–5(e) under the Act exempting them from rule 206(4)–5(a)(1) under the Act to permit Applicants to receive compensation from a government entity for investment advisory services provided to the government entity within the two-year period following a contribution by a covered associate of the Applicants to an official of the government entity.

FILING DATES: The application was filed on March 1, 2018, and amended and restated applications were filed on August 31, 2018, and January 28, 2019.

HEARING OR NOTIFICATION OF HEARING: An order granting the application will be issued unless the Commission orders a hearing. Interested persons may request a hearing by writing to the Commission's Secretary and serving Applicants with a copy of the request, personally or by mail. Hearing requests should be received by the Commission by 5:30 p.m. on April 22, 2019, and should be accompanied by proof of service on Applicants, in the form of an affidavit or, for lawyers, a certificate of service. Pursuant to rule 0–5 under the Act, hearing requests should state the nature of the writer's interest, any facts bearing upon the desirability of a

hearing on the matter, the reason for the request, and the issues contested. Persons may request notification of a hearing by writing to the Commission's Secretary.

ADDRESSES: The Commission: Secretary, U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission, 100 F Street NE, Washington, DC 20549–1090. Applicants: Generation Investment Management US LLP, 555 Mission Street, Suite 3400, San Francisco, CA 94105 and Generation Investment Management LLP, 20 Air Street, 7th Floor, London, UK W1B 5AN.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jean E. Minarick, Senior Counsel, at (202) 551- 6811 or Holly Hunter-Ceci, Assistant Chief Counsel, at (202) 551–6825 (Division of Investment Management, Chief Counsel's Office).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The following is a summary of the application. The complete application may be obtained via the Commission's website at *http://www.sec.gov/rules/iareleases.shtml* or by calling (202) 551–8090.

Applicants' Representations

1. Generation US is a financial services firm registered with the Commission as an investment adviser under the Act. Generation UK, the 99.9 percent owner of Generation US, is an exempt reporting adviser under rule 204–4(a) under the Act. The Applicants provide discretionary investment advisory services to a wide variety of investors.

2. The individual who made the campaign contribution that triggered the two-year compensation ban (the ''Contribution'') is Colin le Duc (the ''Contributor''). The Contributor is a founding partner of Generation UK, who also serves on the Management Committee of Generation UK, Generation's governing body. On October 4, 2017, Generation announced that the Contributor had been appointed Co-President of Generation US's new office in San Francisco, its U.S. headquarters, with joint Management Committee responsibility for the office. On June 30, 2018, the Contributor assumed sole responsibility for the office after the other Co-President retired. In his current capacity as President of Generation US's office (and in his former capacity as Co-President of the office), the Contributor is responsible for reporting on United States operations to the Management Committee and for the culture of the office. As a member of the Management Committee of Generation UK and the President (and previously Co-President) of Generation US's office, the Contributor is, and was at the time of the Contribution, an executive officer of the Advisers. Applicants submit that, because the Contributor is, and at the time of the Contribution was, an executive officer of Generation UK and Generation US under rule 206(4)–5(f)(4), he is, and at all relevant times was, a covered associate.

3. The California State Teachers Retirement System (the ''Client''), one of Generation US's clients, is a government entity in the State of California. Generation UK acts as a sub-adviser to Generation US with respect to the Client's investments. The Client is a ''government entity'' as defined in rule 206(4)–5(f)(i).

4. The recipient of the Contribution was ''Newsom for California—Governor 2018,'' the campaign committee for the California gubernatorial campaign of Gavin Newsom (the ''Official''), who, at the time of the Contribution, was the Lieutenant Governor of the State of California. The Client is a state pension fund with a twelve-member board; one board member is the Director of Finance, who is appointed by the Governor of California, and five other board members are directly appointed by the Governor of California. Because he was seeking the office of Governor at the time of the Contribution, the Official was an ''official'' of the Client within the meaning of rule 206(4)–5(f)(6)(ii). The Contribution that triggered rule 206(4)–5's prohibition on compensation under rule 206(4)–5(a)(1) was made on June 7, 2017, for the amount of $5,000. Applicants submit that the Contribution was not motivated by any desire to influence the award of investment advisory business. The Contribution was made, after the Contributor's next-door neighbor sent him, on June 3, 2017, a text message inviting him to a fundraising event for the Official's gubernatorial campaign. His decision to make the Contribution was spontaneous and motivated by his neighbor's request and because the Contributor and his neighbor's children attended the same school. Applicants represent that the Contributor did not have any intention to seek, and no action was taken by the Contributor or the Applicants to obtain, any direct or indirect influence from the Official or any other person.

5. Generation US has been doing business with the Client since 2007. The investments were all made in 2007 and 2008, before the date of the Contribution and before the Official took office. The Client has not materially added to its assets under management by the Advisers, initiated new mandates, or opened new accounts since 2008, although the Client in February 2018 announced that a different Generation investment fund that is also not managed by the Contributor was eligible to receive a commitment from the Client. Neither the Contributor nor anyone whom he supervises was in any way involved in soliciting the Client with respect to its current business or with respect to the Client's February 2018 announcement that a different Generation investment fund was eligible to receive a commitment.

6. The Applicants learned of the Contribution on December 1, 2017, after the Contributor disclosed it in an interview with a regulatory compliance firm engaged by the Applicants to complete its annual ''mock audit.'' Upon discovery of the Contribution, the Contributor, through counsel, requested a refund of the full $5,000 the next business day, and received the refund on December 8, 2017. The Applicants established an escrow account on February 27, 2018 into which they have been depositing an amount equal to the compensation received with respect to the Client's investments since the Contribution Date. Applicants submit that all management fees and incentive fees earned with respect to the Client's investments since the Contribution Date have been placed in escrow and will continue to be placed in escrow pending the outcome of the application.

7. The Applicants' pay-to-play Policy (the ''Policy'') was adopted and implemented in 2011. The Policy requires that all contributions by the Advisers' managing members, executive officer and other ''covered associates,'' as well as all employees, partners, spouses and family members of ''covered associates,'' to any person (including any election committee for the person) who was at the time of the contribution an incumbent, candidate or successful candidate for an elective office of a government entity are prohibited. There is no *de minimis* exemption from the contribution prohibition. Under the Policy, the Advisers circulated multiple compliance alerts reminding employees of the Policy and the strict prohibition on political contributions. After the discovery of the Contribution, the Advisers updated the Policy, which formerly required partners and employees to certify annually to their compliance with the Policy, to certify compliance with the Policy quarterly. In addition, the Advisers retain a compliance vendor to conduct periodic audits and testing of compliance with a variety of restrictions, including those covered in the Policy.

Applicants' Legal Analysis

1. Rule 206(4)–5(a)(1) under the Act prohibits a registered investment adviser from providing investment advisory services for compensation to a government entity within two years after a contribution to an official of a government entity is made by the investment adviser or any covered associate of the investment adviser. The Client is a ''government entity,'' as defined in rule 206(4)–5(f)(5), the Contributor is a ''covered associate'' as defined in rule 206(4)–5(f)(2), and the Official is an ''official'' as defined in rule 206(4)–5(f)(6).

2. Section 206A of the Act authorizes the Commission to ''conditionally or unconditionally exempt any person or transaction . . . from any provision or provisions of [the Act] or of any rule or regulation 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].''

3. Rule 206(4)–5(e) provides that the Commission may conditionally or unconditionally grant an exemption to an investment adviser from the prohibition under rule 206(4)–5(a)(1) upon consideration of the factors listed below, among others:

(1) Whether the 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;

(2) Whether the investment adviser: (i) Before the contribution resulting in the prohibition was made, adopted and implemented policies and procedures reasonably designed to prevent violations of the rule; (ii) prior to or at the time the contribution which resulted in such prohibition was made, had no actual knowledge of the contribution; and (iii) after learning of the contribution: (A) Has taken all available steps to cause the contributor involved in making the contribution which resulted in such prohibition to obtain a return of the contribution; and (B) has taken such other remedial or preventive measures as may be appropriate under the circumstances;

(3) Whether, at the time of the contribution, the contributor was a covered associate or otherwise an employee of the investment adviser, or was seeking such employment;

(4) The timing and amount of the contribution which resulted in the prohibition;

(5) The nature of the election (*e.g.,* federal, state or local); and

(6) The contributor's apparent intent or motive in making the contribution which resulted in the prohibition, as evidenced by the facts and circumstances surrounding such contribution.

4. Applicants request an order pursuant to Section 206A and rule 206(4)–5(e), exempting them from the two-year prohibition on compensation imposed by rule 206(4)–5(a)(1) with respect to investment advisory services provided to the Client within the two-year period following the Contribution.

5. Applicants submit that the exemption is necessary and 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. Applicants further submit that the other factors set forth in rule 206(4)–5(e) similarly weigh in favor of granting an exemption to the Applicants to avoid consequences disproportionate to the violation.

6. Applicant contends that given the nature of the Contribution, and the lack of any evidence that the Advisers or the Contributor intended to, or actually did, interfere with the Client's merit-based process for the selection or retention of investment advisers, the Client's interests are best served by allowing the Advisers and their Client to continue their relationship uninterrupted. Applicants state that causing the Advisers to serve without compensation for a two-year period could result in a financial loss potentially hundreds or thousands of times the amount of the Contribution. Applicants suggest that the policy underlying rule 206(4)–5 is served by ensuring that no improper influence is exercised over investment decisions by governmental entities as a result of campaign contributions, and not by withholding compensation as a result of unintentional violations.

7. Applicants represent that the Policy was adopted and implemented well before the Contribution was made. Applicants further represent that, the Policy is fully compliant with the requirements of rule 206(4)–5 and has been more rigorous than rule 206(4)–5's requirements as the Advisers retain an outside compliance firm to conduct internet testing and review compliance with the Policy as part of the firm's periodic audit process and requires covered associates to certify their compliance with the Policy quarterly.

8. Applicants assert that aside from the Contributor, no employees or covered associates of the Advisers, or any executive or employee of the Advisers' affiliates knew of the Contribution.

9. Applicants assert that after learning of the Contribution, the Advisers caused the Contributor to obtain immediately a full refund of the Contribution. Applicants have, since the discovery of the Contribution updated the Policy to mandate annual live or video-conference training on the Policy, increased the frequency of the internal compliance certifications from annually to quarterly, and increased the frequency of quarterly campaign finance database testing and reviews from annually to quarterly.

10. Applicants state that after learning of the Contribution, it confirmed that although the Contributor's job would not ordinarily cause him to interact with the Client, the Advisers instructed him not to solicit or otherwise communicate with the Client for two years following the date of the Contribution.

11. Applicants state that the Client's investments with the Advisers substantially pre-date the Contribution. They were made on an arms' length basis, and neither the Contributor nor the Advisers took any action to obtain any direct or indirect influence from the Official. Furthermore, no investments were made in the period between the date of the Contribution and the day it was refunded. Applicants also submit that the apparent intent in making the Contribution was not to influence the selection or retention of the Advisers. Applicants represent that the Contributor and the Official have a relationship that arises out of the fact that their children were classmates in the same primary school. Applicants finally state that it was because of that relationship, and the fact that the Contribution was solicited by the Contributor's next-door neighbor, and not because of any desire to influence the award of investment advisory business that the Contributor made the Contribution to the Official's campaign.

12. Applicants submit that neither the Advisers nor the Contributor sought to interfere with the Client's merit-based selection process for advisory services, nor did they seek to negotiate higher fees or greater ancillary benefits than would be achieved in arms' length transactions. Applicants further submit that there was no violation of the Advisers' fiduciary duty to deal fairly or disclose material conflicts given the absence of any intent or action by the Advisers or the Contributor to influence the selection process. Applicants contend that in the case of the Contribution, the imposition of the two-year prohibition on compensation does not achieve rule 206(4)–5's purposes and would result in consequences

disproportionate to the mistake that was made.

Applicants' Conditions

The Applicants agree that any order of the Commission granting the requested relief will be subject to the following conditions:

1. The Contributor will be prohibited from discussing the business of the Advisers with any ''government entity'' client or prospective client for which the Official is an ''official,'' each as defined in rule 206(4)–5(f) until June 7, 2019.

2. The Contributor will receive a written notification of this condition and will provide a quarterly certification of compliance until June 7, 2019. Copies of the certifications will be maintained and preserved in an easily accessible place for a period of not less than five years, the first two years in an appropriate office of the Advisers, and be available for inspection by the staff of the Commission.

3. The Advisers will conduct testing reasonably designed to prevent violations of the conditions of the Order and maintain records regarding such testing, which will be maintained and preserved in an easily accessible place for a period of not less than five years, the first two years in an appropriate office of the Advisers, and be available for inspection by the staff of the Commission.

For the Commission, by the Division of Investment Management, under delegated authority.

Eduardo A. Aleman,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2019–06158 Filed 3–29–19; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8011–01–P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34–85414; File No. SR–CboeEDGX–2019–011]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; Cboe EDGX Exchange, Inc.; Notice of Filing and Immediate Effectiveness of a Proposed Rule Change To Amend the Rules Related to the Designated Primary Market-Maker (''DPM'') Participation Entitlements

March 26, 2019.

Pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (''Act''),[1] and Rule 19b–4 thereunder,[2] notice is hereby given that on March 15, 2019, Cboe EDGX Exchange, Inc. (''Exchange'' or ''EDGX'') filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (''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 the Substance of the Proposed Rule Change

Cboe EDGX Exchange, Inc. (the ''Exchange'' or ''EDGX'') proposes to amend the Rules related to the Designated Primary Market-Maker (''DPM'') participation entitlements. The text of the proposed rule change is provided below and in Exhibit 1.

(additions are *italicized;* deletions are [bracketed])

* * * * *

Rules of Cboe EDGX Exchange, Inc.

* * * * *

Rule 21.8. Order Display and Book Processing

(a)–(c) No change.

(d) Additional Priority Overlays Applicable to the Pro-Rata Allocation Method. In connection with the allocation methodology set forth in paragraph (c) above, the Exchange may apply, on a class-by-class basis, one or more of the following designated market participant overlay priorities in a sequence determined by the Exchange. The Exchange will issue a notice to Options Members which will specify which classes of options are initially subject to these additional priority overlays and will provide such Options Members with reasonable advance notice of any changes to the application of such overlays.

(1)–(2) No change.

(3) Designated Primary Market Maker. The Exchange may determine to grant Designated Primary Market Makers (''DPMs'') *the DPM* participation entitlement[s] *and/or the DPM small order entitlement* pursuant to the provisions of paragraph (g) below. As indicated in such paragraph, *neither* the DPM participation entitlement *nor the DPM small order entitlement* may [only] be in effect [when] *in a class unless* the Customer Overlay is also in effect.

(e)–(f) No change.

(g) Designated Primary Market Maker [Participation] Entitlements. A DPM may be appointed by the Exchange in option classes in accordance with Rule 22.2. [The] *Neither the* DPM participation entitlement[s] *nor DPM small order entitlement may* [shall not] be in effect *in a class* unless the Customer Overlay is *also* in effect. [and] *When in effect,* the *DPM* participation entitlement[s] *and/or DPM small order entitlement* shall only apply to any remaining balance after Priority Customer Orders have been satisfied. The DPM [participation] entitlements are as follows:

(1) *DPM Participation Entitlement.* For each incoming order, if the DPM has a priority quote at the NBBO, its participation entitlement is equal to the greater of (i) the proportion of the total size at the best price represented by the size of its quote, or (ii) sixty percent (60%) of the contracts to be allocated if there is only one (1) other Market Maker quotation or non-Customer order at the NBBO and forty percent (40%) if there are two (2) or more other Market Maker quotes and/or non-Customer orders at the NBBO.

(2) *DPM Small Order Entitlement.* Small size orders will be allocated in full to the DPM if the DPM has a priority quote at the NBBO. The Exchange will review this provision quarterly and will maintain the small order size at a level that will not allow small size orders executed by DPMs to account for more than 40% of the volume executed on the Exchange. Small size orders are defined as incoming orders of five (5) or fewer contracts.

(h) Conditions of Participation Entitlements. In allocating the participation entitlements set forth in this Rule 21.8 to the PMM and the DPM, the following shall apply:

(1) In a class of options where [both] the PMM *participation entitlement,* [and] the DPM participation entitlement[s], *and the DPM small order entitlement* are in effect and an Options Member has preferred an order to a PMM:

(A) if the PMM's priority quote is at the NBBO, the PMM's participation entitlement will supersede the DPM's participation entitlement[s], *and the DPM small order entitlement,* for an order preferred to such PMM;

(B) if the PMM's priority quote is not at the NBBO, the DPM's participation entitlement *or DPM small order entitlement, as applicable,* will apply to that order, provided the DPM's priority quote is at the NBBO;

(C) if an order is preferred to the DPM (*i.e.,* the DPM is also the PMM), the DPM receives the DPM participation entitlement *or DPM small order entitlement, as applicable,* provided the DPM/PMM's priority quote is at the NBBO; and

(D) if neither the PMM's nor the DPM's priority quote is at the NBBO then executed contracts will be allocated in accordance with the pro-rata allocation methodology as described in paragraphs (c) and (e) above without regard to any participation entitlement.

(2) If an incoming order has not been preferred to a PMM by an Options Member, then the DPM['s] participation entitlement *or DPM small order entitlement, as applicable,* will apply to that order, provided the DPM's priority quote is at the NBBO.

(3) The participation entitlements shall not be in effect unless the Customer Overlay is also in effect and the participation entitlements shall only apply to any remaining balance after Priority Customer Orders have been satisfied.

(4) Neither the DPM nor the PMM may be allocated a total quantity greater than the quantity they are quoting at the execution price. If the DPM's or the PMM's allocation of an order pursuant to its participation entitlement is greater than its pro-rata share of priority quotes at the best price at the time

[1] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

[2] 17 CFR 240.19b–4.