

General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade 1994 (GATT 1994), Articles III:4, IX:4, and X:3, the *Agreement on Technical Barriers to Trade*, Article 2 or in the alternative, the *Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures*, Articles 2, 5, and 7, and the *Agreement on Rules of Origin*, Article 2. Additionally, Canada alleges these violations nullify or impair the benefits accruing to Canada under those Agreements and further appear to nullify or impair the benefits accruing to Canada in the sense of *GATT 1994*, Article XXIII:1(b).

Major Issues Raised by Mexico

On December 17, 2008, Mexico requested consultations regarding U.S. mandatory COOL. Mexico challenges the COOL provisions in the *Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946*, as amended by the *Farm, Security, and Rural Investment Act of 2002* and the *Food, Conservation, and Energy Act, 2008*, and implemented by the regulations published in 7 CFR part 60 and 65. Mexico alleges that for certain products, the determination of national origin deviates considerably from international country of origin labeling standards, which has not been justified as necessary to fulfill a legitimate objective.

Mexico further alleges that the U.S. measures appear to be inconsistent with the *General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade 1994 (GATT 1994)*, Articles III, IX, and X, the *Agreement on Technical Barriers to Trade*, Article 2 or in the alternative, the *Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures*, Articles 2, 5, and 7, and the *Agreement on Rules of Origin*, Article 2. Additionally, Mexico alleges these violations nullify or impair the benefits accruing to Mexico under those Agreements and further appear to nullify or impair the benefits accruing to Mexico in the sense of *GATT 1994*, Article XXIII:1(b).

Public Comment: Requirements for Submissions

Interested persons are invited to submit written comments concerning the issues raised in this dispute. Persons may submit public comments electronically to <http://www.regulations.gov> docket number USTR-2009-0004. If you are unable to provide submissions by <http://www.regulations.gov>, please contact Sandy McKinzy at (202) 395-9483 to arrange for an alternative method of transmission.

To submit comments via <http://www.regulations.gov>, enter docket number USTR-2009-0004 on the home

page and click "go". The site will provide a search-results page listing all documents associated with this docket. Find a reference to this notice by selecting "Notice" under "Document Type" on the left side of the search-results page, and click on the link entitled "Send a Comment or Submission." (For further information on using the <http://www.regulations.gov> Web site, please consult the resources provided on the Web site by clicking on "How to Use This Site" on the left side of the home page.)

The <http://www.regulations.gov> site provides the option of providing comments by filling in a "General Comments" field, or by attaching a document. It is expected that most comments will be provided in an attached document. If a document is attached, it is sufficient to type "See attached" in the "General Comments" field.

A person requesting that information contained in a comment submitted by that person be treated as confidential business information must certify that such information is business confidential and would not customarily be released to the public by the submitter. Confidential business information must be clearly designated as such and the submission must be marked "BUSINESS CONFIDENTIAL" at the top and bottom of the cover page and each succeeding page. Any comment containing business confidential information must be submitted by fax to Sandy McKinzy at (202) 395-3640. A non-confidential summary of the confidential information must be submitted to <http://www.regulations.gov>. The non-confidential summary will be placed in the docket and open to public inspection.

Information or advice contained in a comment submitted, other than business confidential information, may be determined by USTR to be confidential in accordance with section 135(g)(2) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2155(g)(2)). If the submitter believes that information or advice may qualify as such, the submitter—

- (1) Must clearly so designate the information or advice;
- (2) Must clearly mark the material as "SUBMITTED IN CONFIDENCE" at the top and bottom of the cover page and each succeeding page; and
- (3) Must provide a non-confidential summary of the information or advice.

Any comment containing confidential information must be submitted by fax to Sandy McKinzy at (202) 395-3640. A non-confidential summary of the confidential information must be

submitted to <http://www.regulations.gov> or by fax. The non-confidential summary will be placed in the docket and open to public inspection.

USTR will maintain a docket on this dispute settlement proceeding, accessible to the public. The public file will include non-confidential comments received by USTR from the public with respect to the dispute; if a dispute settlement panel is convened or in the event of an appeal from such a panel, the U.S. submissions, any non-confidential submissions, or non-confidential summaries of submissions, received from other participants in the dispute; the report of the panel; and, if applicable, the report of the Appellate Body.

Comments will be placed in the docket and open to public inspection pursuant to 15 CFR 2006.13, except confidential business information exempt from public inspection in accordance with 15 CFR 2006.15 or information determined by USTR to be confidential in accordance with 19 U.S.C. 2155(g)(2). Comments open to public inspection may be viewed on the <http://www.regulations.gov> Web site.

Daniel Brinza,

Assistant United States Trade Representative for Monitoring and Enforcement.

[FR Doc. E9-3291 Filed 2-13-09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3190-W9-P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Proposed Collection; Comment Request

Upon Written Request, Copies Available From: Securities and Exchange Commission, Office of Investor Education and Advocacy, Washington, DC 20549-0213.

Extension:

Form 8-K; OMB Control No. 3235-0060; SEC File No. 270-50.

Notice is hereby given that, pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*), the Securities and Exchange Commission ("Commission") is soliciting comments on the collection of information summarized below. The Commission plans to submit this existing collection of information to the Office of Management and Budget for extension and approval.

Form 8-K (17 CFR 249.308) is filed by issuers to satisfy their current reporting obligations pursuant to Sections 13 and 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78m and 78o(d)) in connection with the occurrence of

significant corporate events. The purpose of Form 8-K is to provide investors with prompt disclosure of material information so that investors will be able to make investment and voting decisions better informed and receive information more timely. We estimate that Form 8-K takes 5 hours per response and is filed by 13,200 issuers 8.2 times annually for a total of 108,424 responses annually. We estimate that 75% of the 5 hours per response (3.75 hours) is prepared by the issuer for a total annual reporting burden of 406,590 hours (3.75 hours per response x 108,424 responses).

Written comments are invited on: (a) Whether this collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden imposed by the collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology. Consideration will be given to comments and suggestions submitted in writing within 60 days of this publication.

Please direct your written comments to Charles Boucher, Director/CIO, Securities and Exchange Commission, C/O Shirley Martinson, 6432 General Green Way, Alexandria, Virginia 22312; or send an e-mail to: PRA_Mailbox@sec.gov.

Dated: February 10, 2009.

Florence E. Harmon

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. E9-3238 Filed 2-13-09; 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 Investor Education Advocacy, Washington, DC 20549-0213.

Extension:

Rule 17f-2; SEC File No. 270-233; OMB Control No. 3235-0223.

Notice is hereby given that, pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*), 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.

Rule 17f-2 (17 CFR 270.17f-2) under the Investment Company Act of 1940 (the "Act") (15 U.S.C. 80a-1) is entitled: "Custody of Investments by Registered Management Investment Company." Rule 17f-2 establishes safeguards for arrangements in which a registered management investment company ("fund") is deemed to maintain custody of its own assets, such as when the fund maintains its assets in a facility that provides safekeeping but not custodial services. The rule includes several recordkeeping or reporting requirements. The fund's directors must prepare a resolution designating not more than five fund officers or responsible employees who may have access to the fund's assets. The designated access persons (two or more of whom must act jointly when handling fund assets) must prepare a written notation providing certain information about each deposit or withdrawal of fund assets, and must transmit the notation to another officer or director designated by the directors. Independent public accountants must verify the fund's assets at least three times a year and two of the examinations must be unscheduled.

The requirement that directors designate access persons is intended to ensure that directors evaluate the trustworthiness of insiders who handle fund assets. The requirements that access persons act jointly in handling fund assets, prepare a written notation of each transaction, and transmit the notation to another designated person are intended to reduce the risk of misappropriation of fund assets by access persons, and to ensure that adequate records are prepared, reviewed by a responsible third person, and available for examination by the Commission's examination staff. The requirement that auditors verify fund assets without notice twice each year is intended to provide an additional deterrent to the misappropriation of fund assets and to detect any irregularities.

The Commission staff estimates that each fund makes 941 responses and spends an average of 271 hours annually in complying with the rule's requirements.¹ Commission staff estimates that on an annual basis it

¹ The 941 responses are: 1 (one) response to draft and adopt the resolution and 940 notations. Estimates of the number of hours are based on conversations with individuals in the mutual fund industry. The actual number of hours may vary significantly depending on individual fund assets.

takes: (i) 0.5 hours of fund accounting personnel at a total cost of \$75.50 to draft director resolutions;² (ii) 0.5 hours of the fund's board of directors at a total cost of \$1000 to adopt the resolution; (iii) 263 hours for the fund's accounting personnel at a total cost of \$60,864 to prepare written notations of transactions;³ and (iv) 7 hours for the fund's accounting personnel at a total cost of \$1057 to assist the independent public accountants when they perform verifications of fund assets.⁴ Approximately 300 funds rely upon rule 17f-2 annually.⁵ Thus, the total annual hour burden for rule 17f-2 is estimated to be 81,300 hours.⁶ Based on the total costs per fund listed above, the total cost of the Rule 17f-2's collection of information requirements is estimated to be \$18.9 million.⁷

The estimate of average burden hours is made solely for the purposes of the Paperwork Reduction Act, and is not derived from a comprehensive or even a representative survey or study of the costs of Commission rules and forms. Complying with the collections of information required by rule 17f-2 is mandatory for those funds that maintain custody of their own assets. Responses 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 control number.

Please direct general comments regarding the above information to the following persons: (i) Desk Officer for the Securities and Exchange Commission, Office of Management and Budget, Room 10102, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20503

² This estimate is based on the following calculation: 0.5 (burden hours per fund) x \$151 (fund senior accountant's hourly rate) = \$75.50.

³ Respondents estimated that each fund makes 941 responses on an annual basis and spent a total of 0.28 hours per response. The fund personnel involved are Fund Payable Manager (\$156 hourly rate), Fund Operations Manager (\$252 hourly rate) and Fund Accounting Manager (\$285 hourly rate). The weighted hourly rate of these personnel is \$231. The estimated cost of preparing notations is based on the following calculation: 941 x 0.28 x \$231 = \$60,863.88.

⁴ This estimate is based on the following calculation: 7 x \$151 (fund senior accountant hourly rate) = \$1057.

⁵ Based on a review of Form N-17f-2 filings in 2007, the Commission staff estimates that 300 funds relied on rule 17f-2 in 2007.

⁶ This estimate is based on the following calculation: 300 (funds) x 271 (total annual hourly burden per fund) = 81,300 hours for rule. The annual burden for rule 17f-2 does not include time spent preparing Form N-17f-2. The burden for Form N-17f-2 is included in a separate collection of information.

⁷ This estimate is based on the following calculation: \$62,996.50 (total annual cost per fund) x 300 funds = \$18,898,950.