

state, local, or tribal governments, or by the private sector. This rule will not result in any such expenditure nor will it significantly or uniquely affect small governments.

Executive Orders 12372 and 13132: Federalism

This rule does not have federalism implications warranting the application of Executive Orders No. 12372 and No. 13132. It will not have substantial direct effects on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government.

Executive Order 12866: Regulatory Review

The Department of State does not consider this interim final rule to be a "significant regulatory action" under Executive Order 12866, section 3(f), Regulatory Planning and Review. In addition, the Department is generally exempt from Executive Order 12866 except to the extent that it is promulgating regulations in conjunction with a domestic agency that are significant regulatory actions. The Department has nevertheless reviewed the regulation to ensure its consistency with the regulatory philosophy and principles set forth in that Executive Order.

Executive Order 12988: Civil Justice Reform

The Department has reviewed the regulations in light of sections 3 (a) and 3 (b)(2) of Executive Order No. 12988 to eliminate ambiguity, minimize litigation, establish clear legal standards, and reduce burden.

The Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA), 44 U.S.C. 3501, *et seq.*, Federal agencies must obtain approval from OMB for most collections of information they conduct, sponsor, or require through regulation. The Department of State has determined that this rule does not require new collection of information for purposes of the PRA.

List of Subjects in 22 CFR Part 94

Infants and children, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Treaties.

■ For the reasons set forth in the preamble, 22 CFR part 94 is revised to read as follows:

PART 94—INTERNATIONAL CHILD ABDUCTION

■ 1. The authority citation for part 94 continues to read as follows:

Authority: Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction; International Child Abduction Remedies Act, Public Law 100–300.

■ 2. Section 94.6 is amended by revising the introductory text and revising paragraph (a) and paragraph (l) to read as follows:

§ 94.6 Procedures for children abducted to the United States.

The U.S. Central Authority, or an entity acting at its direction, shall perform the following operational functions with respect to all Hague Convention applications seeking the return of children wrongfully removed to or retained in the United States or seeking access to children in the United States:

(a) Receive all applications seeking return of children wrongfully retained in the United States or seeking access to children in the United States;

* * * * *

(l) Perform such additional functions as determined by the U.S. Central Authority, deemed advisable to maintain U.S. treaty compliance with the Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction.

Dated: July 23, 2008.

Janice Jacobs,

Assistant Secretary of State for Consular Affairs, Department of State.

[FR Doc. E8–18961 Filed 8–14–08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4710–06–P

PENSION BENEFIT GUARANTY CORPORATION

29 CFR Parts 4022 and 4044

Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing and Paying Benefits

AGENCY: Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation's regulations on Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans and Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans prescribe interest assumptions for valuing and paying benefits under terminating single-employer plans. This final rule amends the regulations to adopt interest assumptions for plans with valuation dates in September 2008. Interest assumptions are also published on the PBGC's Web site (<http://www.pbgc.gov>).
DATES: Effective September 1, 2008.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Catherine B. Klion, Manager, Regulatory and Policy Division, Legislative and Regulatory Department, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, 1200 K Street, NW., Washington, DC 20005, 202–326–4024. (TTY/TDD users may call the Federal relay service toll-free at 1–800–877–8339 and ask to be connected to 202–326–4024.)

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The PBGC's regulations prescribe actuarial assumptions—including interest assumptions—for valuing and paying plan benefits of terminating single-employer plans covered by title IV of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974. The interest assumptions are intended to reflect current conditions in the financial and annuity markets.

Three sets of interest assumptions are prescribed: (1) A set for the valuation of benefits for allocation purposes under section 4044 (found in Appendix B to Part 4044), (2) a set for the PBGC to use to determine whether a benefit is payable as a lump sum and to determine lump-sum amounts to be paid by the PBGC (found in Appendix B to Part 4022), and (3) a set for private-sector pension practitioners to refer to if they wish to use lump-sum interest rates determined using the PBGC's historical methodology (found in appendix C to part 4022).

This amendment (1) adds to appendix B to part 4044 the interest assumptions for valuing benefits for allocation purposes in plans with valuation dates during September 2008, (2) adds to appendix B to part 4022 the interest assumptions for the PBGC to use for its own lump-sum payments in plans with valuation dates during September 2008, and (3) adds to appendix C to part 4022 the interest assumptions for private-sector pension practitioners to refer to if they wish to use lump-sum interest rates determined using the PBGC's historical methodology for valuation dates during September 2008.

For valuation of benefits for allocation purposes, the interest assumptions that the PBGC will use (set forth in appendix B to part 4044) will be 6.24 percent for the first 20 years following the valuation date and 5.31 percent thereafter. These interest assumptions represent an increase (from those in effect for August 2008) of 0.19 percent for the first 20 years following the valuation date and 0.19 percent for all years thereafter.

The interest assumptions that the PBGC will use for its own lump-sum payments (set forth in appendix B to part 4022) will be 3.50 percent for the period during which a benefit is in pay

status and 4.00 percent during any years preceding the benefit's placement in pay status. These interest assumptions represent an increase (from those in effect for August 2008) of 0.25 percent in the immediate annuity rate and are otherwise unchanged. For private-sector payments, the interest assumptions (set forth in appendix C to part 4022) will be the same as those used by the PBGC for determining and paying lump sums (set forth in appendix B to part 4022).

The PBGC has determined that notice and public comment on this amendment are impracticable and contrary to the public interest. This finding is based on the need to determine and issue new interest assumptions promptly so that the assumptions can reflect current market conditions as accurately as possible.

Because of the need to provide immediate guidance for the valuation

and payment of benefits in plans with valuation dates during September 2008, the PBGC finds that good cause exists for making the assumptions set forth in this amendment effective less than 30 days after publication.

The 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

29 CFR Part 4022

Employee benefit plans, Pension insurance, Pensions, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

29 CFR Part 4044

Employee benefit plans, Pension insurance, Pensions.

■ In consideration of the foregoing, 29 CFR parts 4022 and 4044 are amended as follows:

PART 4022—BENEFITS PAYABLE IN TERMINATED SINGLE-EMPLOYER PLANS

■ 1. The authority citation for part 4022 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 29 U.S.C. 1302, 1322, 1322b, 1341(c)(3)(D), and 1344.

■ 2. In appendix B to part 4022, Rate Set 179, as set forth below, is added to the table.

Appendix B to Part 4022—Lump Sum Interest Rates for PBGC Payments

* * * * *

Rate set	For plans with a valuation date		Immediate annuity rate (percent)	Deferred annuities (percent)					
	On or after	Before		i_1	i_2	i_3	n_1	n_2	
* 179	* 09-1-08	10-1-08	* 3.50	* 4.00	* 4.00	* 4.00	* 7	* 8	

■ 3. In appendix C to part 4022, Rate Set 179, as set forth below, is added to the table.

Appendix C to Part 4022—Lump Sum Interest Rates for Private-Sector Payments

* * * * *

Rate set	For plans with a valuation date		Immediate annuity rate (percent)	Deferred annuities (percent)					
	On or after	Before		i_1	i_2	i_3	n_1	n_2	
* 179	* 09-1-08	10-1-08	* 3.50	* 4.00	* 4.00	* 4.00	* 7	* 8	

PART 4044—ALLOCATION OF ASSETS IN SINGLE-EMPLOYER PLANS

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

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

■ 5. In appendix B to part 4044, a new entry for September 2008, as set forth below, is added To the table.

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 $t =$
* September 2008	*	*	*	* .0624	* 1-20	* .0531	* >20	* N/A	* N/A

Issued in Washington, DC, on this 11th day of August 2008.

Vincent K. Snowbarger,

Deputy Director for Operations, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation.

[FR Doc. E8-19061 Filed 8-14-08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7709-01-P

POSTAL REGULATORY COMMISSION

39 CFR Part 3020

[Docket No. MC2008-5; Order No. 94]

Administrative Practice and Procedure, Postal Service

AGENCY: Postal Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Commission is adding the Postal Service's Express Mail Contract 1 to the competitive product list. This action is consistent with changes in a recent law governing postal operations. Re-publication of the lists of market dominant and competitive products is also consistent with new requirements in the law.

DATES: Effective August 15, 2008.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments electronically via the Commission's Filing Online system at <http://www.prc.gov>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Stephen L. Sharfman, General Counsel, 202-789-6820 and stephen.sharfman@prc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

On July 21, 2008, the Postal Service filed a request pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 3642 and 39 CFR 3020.30, *et seq.* to modify the Mail Classification Schedule by adding Express Mail Contract 1 to the competitive product list. The Postal Service asserts that Express Mail Contract 1 is a competitive product "not of general applicability" within the meaning of 39 U.S.C. 3632(b)(3).¹ A redacted version of the Governors' Decision establishing the price and classification and a certification of the Governors' vote is included as Attachment A to the filing (Attachment A). The requested changes in the Mail Classification Schedule product list are included in the filing as Attachment B with the new product shown in brackets.² The statement of supporting

justification required by 39 CFR 3020.32 is included as Attachment C to the filing (Attachment C).

In the same July 21, 2008 filing, the Postal Service gives notice, pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 3632(b)(3) and 39 CFR 3015.5, that the Governors have established prices and classifications not of general applicability for Express Mail Contract 1. Request at 2.

In support of its Request, the Postal Service has also filed materials under seal, including an unredacted version of an explanation and justification in the Governors' Decision and an unredacted analysis. Also filed under seal are the cost and revenue data and the certification of compliance with 39 U.S.C. 3633(a)(1), (2), and (3). The Postal Service asserts "that the contract, related financial information, the customer's name and the portions of the Governors' Decision and accompanying analysis that provides prices, terms, and conditions should remain confidential." *Id.*

After its initial review, the Commission sought additional information with respect to several issues in this case. Toward that end, it issued Commission Information Request No. 1 on July 29, 2008.³ The Postal Service promptly responded providing the requested clarifying information on August 4, 2008.⁴

As noted above, the Postal Service filing in this docket was made pursuant to rule 3015.5 and rule 3020.30 *et seq.* As a consequence, the Commission will review the filing under both rule 3015 and part 3020, subpart B.

II. Comments

Comments were filed by United Parcel Service (UPS),⁵ the Public Representative,⁶ and David B. Popkin.⁷

providing interested persons an opportunity to comment on the draft MCS in the near future.

³ Commission Information Request No. 1, July 29, 2008.

⁴ See Notice of Response of the United States Postal Service to Commission Information Request No. 1, August 4, 2008.

⁵ Comments of United Parcel Service in Response to Order Concerning Modification of the Mail Classification Schedule and Prices Under Express Mail Negotiated Service Agreement, July 31, 2008 (UPS Comments).

⁶ Public Representative Comments in Response to United States Postal Service Request to Modify the Mail Classification Schedule and Prices Under Express Mail Negotiated Service Agreement, July 31, 2008 (Public Representative Comments).

⁷ Initial Comments of David B. Popkin, July 31, 2008 (Popkin Comments). Popkin also filed a Letter of Intervention and Request for Information, Letter from David B. Popkin to Steven W. Williams, Notice of Intervention and Request for Information, July 30, 2008 (Letter). The Commission notes that notices of intervention are not necessary for the filing of comments in these types of proceedings and are, in fact, discouraged. Where appropriate,

UPS urges the Commission to require public disclosure of the proposed contracts subject to adequate safeguards to allow meaningful public review. It believes that if interested parties are denied access to this information, the complaint process under section 3662 will be largely rendered a nullity. UPS Comments at 2.

Along the same lines, Popkin expresses concern that because the Postal Service's filing was largely under seal, the public cannot comment meaningfully on it. Popkin Comments at 2. In addition, Popkin offers several observations about the filing in this case and waiver of signature upon delivery. *Id.* at 3.

The Public Representative comments on several aspects of the Postal Service's filings in this case including (1) confidentiality; (2) pricing, cost coverage, and contribution; and (3) the specific agreement. With respect to confidentiality, the Public Representative argues that the Postal Service should justify the limits of all confidentiality requests to comport with the spirit of Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 26(c) and the Freedom of Information Act. Public Representative Comments at 3. With respect to pricing, cost coverage and contribution, the Public Representative acknowledges that the pricing in the negotiated service agreement (NSA) comports with the provisions of title 39. With respect to the specific agreement, the Public Representative believes that it promotes an increased Express Mail volume, specifically pieces that are less costly to process. *Id.* at 5.

III. Commission Analysis

A. Statutory Requirements

The statutory responsibility of the Commission, in this instance, is to assign a new product to either the market dominant list or the competitive product list. 39 U.S.C. 3642. As part of this responsibility, the Commission also will preliminarily review the proposal for compliance with the requirements of the Postal Accountability and Enhancement Act (PAEA) of 2006. For proposed competitive products, this includes a review of the provisions applicable to rates for competitive products. 39 U.S.C. 3633.

The Postal Service contends that adding the Express Mail Contract 1 product will result in processing Express Mail pieces that are less costly for the Postal Service than the average Express Mail piece. See Request, Attachment A. It believes that its

motions may be filed under Commission rule 3001.21.

¹ Request of the United States Postal Service to Add Express Mail Contract to Competitive Product List and Notice of Establishment of Rates and Class Not of General Applicability, July 21, 2008 (Request).

² The draft Mail Classification Schedule (MCS) remains under review. The Commission anticipates