the Commission believes that it is important to clearly establish the minimum price variation for Mini Options prior to the anticipated commencement of trading on March 18, 2013.

Commenters offer strong support for the Exchanges' proposals. <sup>16</sup> In their letters, SIFMA and LiquidPoint state that they strongly agree with CBOE's request to mimic the pricing convention of standard options with mini-option contract pricing and note that they believe it is appropriate to allow penny-pricing for Mini Options on securities for which standard options already trade in pennies, specifically SPY, AAPL, GLD, and AMZN. <sup>17</sup>

In its letter, SIFMA notes that given the significant liquidity in the market for the standard options on SPY, AAPL, GLD, GOOG, and AMZN, "investor confusion could be profound if the standard and mini-options are not aligned with respect to the minimum price variation."<sup>18</sup> LiquidPoint also expressed similar concern in its letter.<sup>19</sup> Further, in its letter, TD Ameritrade states that "[i]nvestor confusion would invariably result if Mini Options did not retain the important characteristics, such as the trading increments," of the standard options on the same underlying security.<sup>20</sup> The Commission believes that allowing the same minimum price variation for Mini Options as standard options on the same underlying security should help prevent investor confusion.

Maintaining consistency between Mini Options and standard options as to the minimum price variation may also provide additional market benefits. In this regard, the Commission notes that, in its proposal, CBOE states its belief that matched pricing for Mini Options and standard options on the same underlying security would attract additional liquidity providers who would make markets in these options and that the ability to quote Mini Options and standard options on the same underlying security in the same minimum increments would hopefully result in more efficient pricing via arbitrage and possible price improvement in both contracts on the same underlying security.<sup>21</sup> SIFMA and LiquidPoint also note that penny pricing for Mini Options "would benefit anticipated users by providing additional price points, particularly as the product is intended to be an investment tool with more affordable and realistic prices for the average retail investor." 22 Further, TD Ameritrade states that the proposal will allow market makers to "provide better fills to investors by quoting and trading within a lesser spread than the existing Rule 710 allows." <sup>23</sup>

The Commission notes that the proposed minimum price variation treatment is also consistent with the current operation of member firms systems. Specifically, in its proposal, CBOE states that it has polled its member firms with customers who would be potential users of Mini Options, and these firms have indicated a preference that the premium pricing for Mini Options match what is currently permitted for standard options on the same underlying securities.24 CBOE states that its firms' systems are configured using the "root symbol" of an underlying security and cannot differentiate, for purposes of minimum price variations, between contracts on the same underlying security.<sup>25</sup> In its letter, SIFMA also notes that its members' systems are programmed using "root symbols," and would not be able to assign different minimum price variations to Mini Options and standard options on the same underlying security.<sup>26</sup> Further, LiquidPoint notes that its systems are programmed such that it would be difficult and confusing to systems users to assign different

minimum price variations to Mini Options and standard options on the same underlying security.<sup>27</sup>

Lastly, the Commission notes that, with respect to the impact of the proposals on the Exchanges' systems capacity, each of the Exchanges represents that it and the Options Price Reporting Authority have the necessary systems capacity to handle the potential additional traffic associated with this proposal.<sup>28</sup> The Exchanges state that they do not believe that the increased traffic will become unmanageable because Mini Options are limited to a fixed number of underlying securities.<sup>29</sup>

Accordingly, for the reasons stated above, and in consideration of the anticipated Mini Options launch date of March 18, 2013, the Commission finds good cause, pursuant to Section 19(b)(2) of the Act, <sup>30</sup> for approving the Exchanges' proposals prior to the 30th day after the publication of the notices in the **Federal Register**.

#### **IV. Conclusion**

It is therefore ordered, pursuant to Section 19(b)(2) of the Act,<sup>31</sup> that the proposed rule changes (SR–CBOE–2013–016; SR–ISE–2013–08), be, and hereby are, approved on an accelerated basis

For the Commission, by the Division of Trading and Markets, pursuant to delegated authority.  $^{32}$ 

## Kevin M. O'Neill,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2013-06121 Filed 3-15-13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8011-01-P

# SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION [Docket No. SSA-2012-0048]

# Service Delivery Plan; Correction

**AGENCY:** Social Security Administration. **ACTION:** Notice; request for comments; Correction.

SUMMARY: The Social Security Administration published a document in the Federal Register of March 12, 2013, in FR Doc. 2013–05595, on page 15797, in the third column; in the SUMMARY caption insert the following hyper-links. In the first sentence after the words, "Service Delivery Plan (SDP) insert http://www.ssa.gov/open/SDP. In

the current proposals are limited to the five approved Mini Options, and the Exchanges must submit subsequent proposed rule changes to extend such treatment of minimum price variations to new Mini Options. See CBOE Notice, supra note 3, at n.7.

 $<sup>^{16}\,</sup>See$  SIFMA Letter, supra note 4; LiquidPoint Letter, supra note 4; and TD Ameritrade Letter, supra note 7. In his comment letter, Sheedy suggested that Mini Options should not be settled by using a portion of a standard option such that a standard option would be "split," resulting in a fractional ownership of a standard option. Sheedy also opined that the option symbols designating each type of option should be distinct and easily identifiable in order to minimize inadvertent mistakes in rapidly changing markets. See Sheedy Letter, supra note 4. In its response letter, CBOE notes that the deliverable security for standard options will not be used to settle Mini Options on the same underlying security. See CBOE Response Letter, *supra* note 5, at 1–2. CBOE also reiterates that Mini Options will be designated with different trading symbols than standard options on the same underlying security. See id., at 2. Further, CBOE notes that the industry-wide symbology for Mini Options will be the use of the same symbol that currently exists for standard options on the same underlying security, followed by "7." See id.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>17</sup> See SIFMA Letter, supra note 4, at 1–2 and LiquidPoint Letter, supra note 4, at 1.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>18</sup> See SIFMA Letter, supra note 4, at 2.

<sup>19</sup> See LiquidPoint Letter, supra note 4, at 2.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>20</sup> See TD Ameritrade Letter, supra note 7, at 1.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>21</sup> See CBOE Notice, supra note 3, at 10673.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>22</sup> See also SIFMA Letter, supra note 4, at 2 and LiquidPoint Letter, supra note 4, at 2.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>23</sup> See TD Ameritrade Letter, supra note 7, at 1. <sup>24</sup> See CBOE Notice, supra note 3, at 10672.

<sup>25</sup> See id.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>26</sup> See SIFMA Letter, supra note 4, at 2.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>27</sup> See LiquidPoint Letter, supra note 4, at 2.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>28</sup> See CBOE Notice, supra note 3, at 10673 and ISE Notice, supra note 6, at 11922.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>29</sup> See CBOE Notice, supra note 3, at 10673 and ISE Notice, supra note 6, at 11922.

<sup>30 15</sup> U.S.C. 78s(b)(2).

<sup>31 15</sup> U.S.C. 78s(b)(2)

<sup>32 17</sup> CFR 200.30-3(a)(12).

addition, in the third sentence after the words "Agency Strategic Plan" insert http://ssa.gov/asp/plan-2013-2016.pdf.

#### Paul Kryglik,

Director, Office of Regulations, Social Security Administration.

[FR Doc. 2013-06089 Filed 3-15-13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4191-02-P

#### **DEPARTMENT OF STATE**

[Public Notice 8240]

U.S. Department of State Advisory Committee on Private International Law (ACPIL): Notice of Public Meeting of the Study Group on Choice of Law in International Commercial Contracts

The Office of the Assistant Legal Adviser for Private International Law, Department of State, hereby gives notice of a public meeting of the Študy Group on Choice of Law in International Commercial Contracts. A working group of experts from various countries was established by the Hague Conference on Private International Law to develop non-binding principles relevant to the choice of law in international commercial contracts. The draft principles prepared by that group were considered at a Special Commission of the Hague Conference held November 12–16, 2012. We expect that the Council on General Affairs and Policy of the Hague Conference will request that the working group of experts prepare a detailed commentary to accompany the principles.

The purpose of the public meeting is to obtain the views of concerned stakeholders in advance of the Council meeting in April. This is not a meeting of the full Advisory Committee. The Draft Hague Principles as approved by the November 2012 Special Commission meeting on choice of law in international contracts, and Recommendations for the commentary and other relevant documents can be found at the following link: http://www.hcch.net/

 $index\_en.php?act=text.display\&tid=49.$ 

Time and Place: The meeting of the ACPIL Study Group will take place on April 1, 2013 from 10:30 a.m. to 1:30 p.m. EDT in Room 240, South Building, State Department Annex 4. Participants should arrive at the Navy Hill gate at the corner of 23rd Street NW. and D Street NW before 10:00 a.m. for visitor screening. Persons arriving later will need to make arrangements for entry using the contact information provided below. If you are unable to attend the public meeting and would like to

participate from a remote location, teleconferencing will be available.

*Public Participation:* This meeting is open to the public, subject to the capacity of the meeting room. Access to Navy Hill is strictly controlled. For preclearance purposes, those planning to attend in person are requested to email or phone Tricia Smeltzer (smeltzertk@state.gov, 202–776–8423) or Niesha Toms (tomsnn@state.gov, 202-776-8420) and provide your full name, address, date of birth, citizenship, driver's license or passport number, affiliation, and email address. This will greatly facilitate entry. Participants will be met at the Navy Hill gate at 23rd and D Streets NW., and will be escorted to the South Building.

A member of the public needing reasonable accommodation should advise Ms. Smeltzer or Ms. Toms not later than March 25, 2013. Requests made after that date will be considered, but might not be able to be fulfilled. If you would like to participate by telephone, please contact Ms. Smeltzer or Ms. Toms to obtain the call-in number and other information.

Data from the public is requested pursuant to Public Law 99–399 (Omnibus Diplomatic Security and Antiterrorism Act of 1986), as amended; Public Law 107–56 (USA PATRIOT Act); and Executive Order 13356. The purpose of the collection is to validate the identity of individuals who enter Department facilities. The data will be entered into the Visitor Access Control System (VACS–D) database. Please see the Security Records System of Records Notice (State-36) at http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/103419.pdf for additional information.

Dated: March 7, 2013.

#### Michael Dennis,

Office of Private International Law, Office of the Legal Adviser, Department of State. [FR Doc. 2013–06185 Filed 3–15–13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4710-08-P

# OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE

[Dispute No. WTO/DS429]

WTO Dispute Settlement Proceeding Regarding United States—Anti-Dumping Measures on Certain Shrimp From Vietnam

**AGENCY:** Office of the United States Trade Representative.

**ACTION:** Notice; request for comments.

**SUMMARY:** The Office of the United States Trade Representative ("USTR") is providing notice that the Socialist

Republic of Vietnam ("Vietnam") has requested the establishment of a dispute settlement panel under the Marrakesh Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization ("WTO Agreement"). That request may be found at www.wto.org contained in a document designated as WT/DS429/3. USTR invites written comments from the public concerning the issues raised in this dispute.

**DATES:** Although USTR will accept any comments received during the course of the dispute settlement proceedings, comments should be submitted on or before April 16, 2013 to be assured of timely consideration by USTR.

ADDRESSES: Public comments should be submitted electronically to www.regulations.gov, docket number USTR-2012-0003. If you are unable to provide submissions at www.regulations.gov, please contact Sandy McKinzy at (202) 395-9483 to arrange for an alternative method of transmission.

If (as explained below) the comment contains confidential information, then the comment should be submitted by fax only to Sandy McKinzy at (202) 395–3640.

### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Matthew P. Jaffe, Assistant General Counsel, Office of the United States Trade Representative, 600 17th Street NW., Washington, DC 20508, (202) 395– 3150

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Section 127(b) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act ("URAA") (19 U.S.C. 3537(b)(1)) requires that notice and opportunity for comment be provided after the United States submits or receives a request for the establishment of a WTO dispute settlement panel. Consistent with this obligation, USTR is providing notice that a dispute settlement panel has been established pursuant to the WTO Dispute Settlement Understanding ("DSU"). The panel will hold its meetings in Geneva, Switzerland.

# Major Issues Raised by Vietnam

In its January 17, 2013 panel request, Vietnam makes a number of allegations relating to certain antidumping administrative reviews and a sunset review conducted by the Department of Commerce on certain frozen warmwater shrimp from Vietnam. Specifically, Vietnam challenges: the imposition of antidumping duties and cash deposit requirements pursuant to the final results of the fourth administrative review for the period from February 1, 2008, to January 31, 2009, in *Certain Frozen Warmwater Shrimp From the Socialist Republic of Vietnam: Final*