

and of sections 201.10 and 210.8(c) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 201.10, 210.8(c)).

By order of the Commission.

Issued: December 20, 2012.

Lisa R. Barton,

Acting Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2012-31156 Filed 12-27-12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Docket No. 2924]

Certain Paper Shredders, Certain Processes for Manufacturing or Relating to Same and Certain Products Containing Same and Certain Parts Thereof Notice of Receipt of Complaint; Solicitation of Comments Relating to the Public Interest

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has received a complaint entitled *Certain Paper Shredders, Certain Processes for Manufacturing or Relating to Same and Certain Products Containing Same and Certain Parts Thereof*, DN 2924; the Commission is soliciting comments on any public interest issues raised by the complaint or complainant's filing under section 210.8(b) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 210.8(b)).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Lisa R. Barton, Acting Secretary to the Commission, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 205-2000. The public version of the complaint can be accessed on the Commission's electronic docket (EDIS) at <http://edis.usitc.gov>, and will be available for inspection during official business hours (8:45 a.m. to 5:15 p.m.) in the Office of the Secretary, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 205-2000.

General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its Internet server (<http://www.usitc.gov>). The public record for this investigation may be viewed on the Commission's electronic docket (EDIS) at <http://edis.usitc.gov>. Hearing-impaired persons are advised that information on this matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal on (202) 205-1810.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Commission has received a complaint and a submission pursuant to section 210.8(b) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure filed on behalf of Fellowes, Inc. and Fellowes Office Products (Suzhou) Co. Ltd. on December 20, 2012. The complaint alleges violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1337) in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, and the sale within the United States after importation of certain paper shredders, certain processes for manufacturing or relating to same and certain products containing same and certain parts thereof. The complaint names as respondents New United Co. Group Ltd. of China; Jiangsu New United Office Equipments Co. Ltd. of China; Shenzhen Elite Business Office Equipment Co. Ltd. of China; Elite Business Machines Ltd. of China; New United Office Equipment USA, Inc. of IL; Jiangsu Shinri Machinery Co. Ltd. of China; Zhou Licheng of China; Randall Graves of China; and "Jessica" Wang Chongge of China.

Proposed respondents, other interested parties, and members of the public are invited to file comments, not to exceed five (5) pages in length, inclusive of attachments, on any public interest issues raised by the complaint or section 210.8(b) filing. Comments should address whether issuance of the relief specifically requested by the complainant in this investigation would affect the public health and welfare in the United States, competitive conditions in the United States economy, the production of like or directly competitive articles in the United States, or United States consumers.

In particular, the Commission is interested in comments that:

- (i) Explain how the articles potentially subject to the requested remedial orders are used in the United States;
- (ii) Identify any public health, safety, or welfare concerns in the United States relating to the requested remedial orders;
- (iii) Identify like or directly competitive articles that complainant, its licensees, or third parties make in the United States which could replace the subject articles if they were to be excluded;
- (iv) Indicate whether complainant, complainant's licensees, and/or third party suppliers have the capacity to replace the volume of articles potentially subject to the requested exclusion order and/or a cease and desist order within a commercially reasonable time; and

(v) Explain how the requested remedial orders would impact United States consumers.

Written submissions must be filed no later than by close of business, eight calendar days after the date of publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**. There will be further opportunities for comment on the public interest after the issuance of any final initial determination in this investigation.

Persons filing written submissions must file the original document electronically on or before the deadlines stated above and submit 8 true paper copies to the Office of the Secretary by noon the next day pursuant to section 210.4(f) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 210.4(f)). Submissions should refer to the docket number ("Docket No. 2924") in a prominent place on the cover page and/or the first page. (See Handbook for Electronic Filing Procedures, http://www.usitc.gov/secretary/fed_reg_notices/rules/handbook_on_electronic_filing.pdf). Persons with questions regarding filing should contact the Secretary (202-205-2000).

Any person desiring to submit a document to the Commission in confidence must request confidential treatment. All such requests should be directed to the Secretary to the Commission and must include a full statement of the reasons why the Commission should grant such treatment. See 19 CFR 201.6. Documents for which confidential treatment by the Commission is properly sought will be treated accordingly. All nonconfidential written submissions will be available for public inspection at the Office of the Secretary and on EDIS.

This action is taken under the authority of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1337), and of sections 201.10 and 210.8(c) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 201.10, 210.8(c)).

By order of the Commission.

Issued: December 21, 2012.

Lisa R. Barton,

Acting Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2012-31160 Filed 12-27-12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

Summary of Commission Practice Relating to Administrative Protective Orders

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Summary of Commission practice relating to administrative protective orders.

SUMMARY: Since February 1991, the U.S. International Trade Commission (“Commission”) has issued an annual report on the status of its practice with respect to violations of its administrative protective orders (“APOs”) under title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930, in response to a direction contained in the Conference Report to the Customs and Trade Act of 1990. Over time, the Commission has added to its report discussions of APO breaches in Commission proceedings other than under title VII and violations of the Commission’s rules including the rule on bracketing business proprietary information (“BPI”) (the “24-hour rule”), 19 CFR 207.3(c). This notice provides a summary of investigations completed during calendar year 2011 of breaches in proceedings under title VII and section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930. There were no rules violation investigations completed in 2011. The Commission intends that this report inform representatives of parties to Commission proceedings as to some specific types of APO breaches encountered by the Commission and the corresponding types of actions the Commission has taken.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Carol McCue Verratti, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, telephone (202) 205–3088. Hearing impaired individuals are advised that information on this matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission’s TDD terminal at (202) 205–1810. General information concerning the Commission can also be obtained by accessing its Web site. (<http://www.usitc.gov>).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Representatives of parties to investigations or other proceedings conducted under title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930, section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) Article 1904.13, and safeguard-related provisions such as section 202 of the Trade Act of 1974, may enter into APOs that permit them, under strict conditions, to obtain access to BPI (title VII) and confidential business information (“CBI”) (safeguard-related provisions and section 337) of other parties. *See, e.g.*, 19 U.S.C. 1677f; 19 CFR 207.7; 19 U.S.C. 1337(n); 19 CFR 210.5, 210.34; 19 U.S.C. 2252(i); 19 CFR 206.17; and 19 U.S.C. 1516a(g)(7)(A); 19 CFR 207.100, *et seq.*. The discussion below describes APO breach investigations that the

Commission has completed during calendar year 2011, including a description of actions taken in response to these breaches.

Since 1991, the Commission has published annually a summary of its actions in response to violations of Commission APOs and the 24-hour rule. *See* 56 FR 4846 (February 6, 1991); 57 FR 12335 (April 9, 1992); 58 FR 21991 (April 26, 1993); 59 FR 16834 (April 8, 1994); 60 FR 24880 (May 10, 1995); 61 FR 21203 (May 9, 1996); 62 FR 13164 (March 19, 1997); 63 FR 25064 (May 6, 1998); 64 FR 23355 (April 30, 1999); 65 FR 30434 (May 11, 2000); 66 FR 27685 (May 18, 2001); 67 FR 39425 (June 7, 2002); 68 FR 28256 (May 23, 2003); 69 FR 29972 (May 26, 2004); 70 FR 42382 (July 25, 2005); 71 FR 39355 (July 12, 2006); 72 FR 50119 (August 30, 2007); 73 FR 51843 (September 5, 2008); 74 FR 54071 (October 21, 2009); 75 FR 54071 (October 27, 2010) and 76 FR 78945 (December 20, 2011). This report does not provide an exhaustive list of conduct that will be deemed to be a breach of the Commission’s APOs. APO breach inquiries are considered on a case-by-case basis.

As part of the effort to educate practitioners about the Commission’s current APO practice, the Commission Secretary issued in March 2005 a fourth edition of *An Introduction to Administrative Protective Order Practice in Import Injury Investigations* (Pub. No. 3755). This document is available upon request from the Office of the Secretary, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436, tel. (202) 205–2000 and on the Commission’s Web site at <http://www.usitc.gov>.

I. In General

The current APO form for antidumping and countervailing duty investigations, which was revised in March 2005, requires the applicant to swear that he or she will:

(1) Not divulge any of the BPI disclosed under this APO or otherwise obtained in this investigation and not otherwise available to him or her, to any person other than—

(i) Personnel of the Commission concerned with the investigation,

(ii) The person or agency from whom the BPI was obtained,

(iii) A person whose application for disclosure of BPI under this APO has been granted by the Secretary, and

(iv) Other persons, such as paralegals and clerical staff, who (a) are employed or supervised by and under the direction and control of the authorized applicant or another authorized applicant in the same firm whose

application has been granted; (b) have a need thereof in connection with the investigation; (c) are not involved in competitive decision making for an interested party which is a party to the investigation; and (d) have signed the acknowledgment for clerical personnel in the form attached hereto (the authorized applicant shall also sign such acknowledgment and will be deemed responsible for such persons’ compliance with this APO);

(2) Use such BPI solely for the purposes of the above-captioned Commission investigation or for judicial or binational panel review of such Commission investigation;

(3) Not consult with any person not described in paragraph (1) concerning BPI disclosed under this APO or otherwise obtained in this investigation without first having received the written consent of the Secretary and the party or the representative of the party from whom such BPI was obtained;

(4) Whenever materials *e.g.*, documents, computer disks, etc. containing such BPI are not being used, store such material in a locked file cabinet, vault, safe, or other suitable container (N.B.: storage of BPI on so-called hard disk computer media is to be avoided, because mere erasure of data from such media may not irrecoverably destroy the BPI and may result in violation of paragraph C of this APO);

(5) Serve all materials containing BPI disclosed under this APO as directed by the Secretary and pursuant to section 207.7(f) of the Commission’s rules;

(6) Transmit each document containing BPI disclosed under this APO:

(i) With a cover sheet identifying the document as containing BPI,

(ii) with all BPI enclosed in brackets and each page warning that the document contains BPI,

(iii) if the document is to be filed by a deadline, with each page marked “Bracketing of BPI not final for one business day after date of filing,” and

(iv) if by mail, within two envelopes, the inner one sealed and marked “Business Proprietary Information—To be opened only by [name of recipient]”, and the outer one sealed and not marked as containing BPI;

(7) Comply with the provision of this APO and section 207.7 of the Commission’s rules;

(8) Make true and accurate representations in the authorized applicant’s application and promptly notify the Secretary of any changes that occur after the submission of the application and that affect the representations made in the application

(e.g., change in personnel assigned to the investigation);

(9) Report promptly and confirm in writing to the Secretary any possible breach of this APO; and

(10) Acknowledge that breach of this APO may subject the authorized applicant and other persons to such sanctions or other actions as the Commission deems appropriate, including the administrative sanctions and actions set out in this APO.

The APO further provides that breach of an APO may subject an applicant to:

(1) Disbarment from practice in any capacity before the Commission along with such person's partners, associates, employer, and employees, for up to seven years following publication of a determination that the order has been breached;

(2) Referral to the United States Attorney;

(3) In the case of an attorney, accountant, or other professional, referral to the ethics panel of the appropriate professional association;

(4) Such other administrative sanctions as the Commission determines to be appropriate, including public release of, or striking from the record any information or briefs submitted by, or on behalf of, such person or the party he represents; denial of further access to business proprietary information in the current or any future investigations before the Commission, and issuance of a public or private letter of reprimand; and

(5) Such other actions, including but not limited to, a warning letter, as the Commission determines to be appropriate.

APOs in investigations other than those under title VII contain similar, though not identical, provisions.

Commission employees are not signatories to the Commission's APOs and do not obtain access to BPI through APO procedures. Consequently, they are not subject to the requirements of the APO with respect to the handling of CBI and BPI. However, Commission employees are subject to strict statutory and regulatory constraints concerning BPI and CBI, and face potentially severe penalties for noncompliance. *See* 18 U.S.C. 1905; title 5, U.S. Code; and Commission personnel policies implementing the statutes. Although the Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. 552a) limits the Commission's authority to disclose any personnel action against agency employees, this should not lead the public to conclude that no such actions have been taken.

An important provision of the Commission's title VII and safeguard rules relating to BPI/CBI is the "24-

hour" rule. This rule provides that parties have one business day after the deadline for filing documents containing BPI/CBI to file a public version of the document. The rule also permits changes to the bracketing of information in the proprietary version within this one-day period. No changes—other than changes in bracketing—may be made to the proprietary version. The rule was intended to reduce the incidence of APO breaches caused by inadequate bracketing and improper placement of BPI/CBI. The Commission urges parties to make use of the rule. If a party wishes to make changes to a document other than bracketing, such as typographical changes or other corrections, the party must ask for an extension of time to file an amended document pursuant to section 201.14(b)(2) of the Commission's rules.

II. Investigations of Alleged APO Breaches

Upon finding evidence of an APO breach or receiving information that there is a reason to believe one has occurred, the Commission Secretary notifies relevant offices in the agency that an APO breach investigation has commenced and that an APO breach investigation file has been opened. Upon receiving notification from the Secretary, the Office of the General Counsel ("OGC") prepares a letter of inquiry to be sent to the possible breacher over the Secretary's signature to ascertain the possible breacher's views on whether a breach has occurred.¹ If, after reviewing the response and other relevant information, the Commission determines that a breach has occurred, the Commission often issues a second letter asking the breacher to address the questions of mitigating circumstances and possible sanctions or other actions. The Commission then determines what action to take in response to the breach. In some cases, the Commission determines that, although a breach has occurred, sanctions are not warranted, and therefore finds it unnecessary to issue a second letter concerning what sanctions might be appropriate. Instead, it issues a warning letter to the individual. A warning letter is not considered to be a sanction.

¹ Procedures for inquiries to determine whether a prohibited act such as a breach has occurred and for imposing sanctions for violation of the provisions of a protective order issued during NAFTA panel or committee proceedings are set out in 19 CFR §§ 207.100–207.120. Those investigations are initially conducted by the Commission's Office of Unfair Import Investigations.

Sanctions for APO violations serve two basic interests: (a) Preserving the confidence of submitters of BPI/CBI that the Commission is a reliable protector of BPI/CBI; and (b) disciplining breachers and deterring future violations. As the Conference Report to the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988 observed, "[T]he effective enforcement of limited disclosure under administrative protective order depends in part on the extent to which private parties have confidence that there are effective sanctions against violation." H.R. Conf. Rep. No. 576, 100th Cong., 1st Sess. 623 (1988).

The Commission has worked to develop consistent jurisprudence, not only in determining whether a breach has occurred, but also in selecting an appropriate response. In determining the appropriate response, the Commission generally considers mitigating factors such as the unintentional nature of the breach, the lack of prior breaches committed by the breaching party, the corrective measures taken by the breaching party, and the promptness with which the breaching party reported the violation to the Commission. The Commission also considers aggravating circumstances, especially whether persons not under the APO actually read the BPI/CBI. The Commission considers whether there have been prior breaches by the same person or persons in other investigations and multiple breaches by the same person or persons in the same investigation.

The Commission's rules permit an economist or consultant to obtain access to BPI/CBI under the APO in a title VII or safeguard investigation if the economist or consultant is under the direction and control of an attorney under the APO, or if the economist or consultant appears regularly before the Commission and represents an interested party who is a party to the investigation. 19 CFR 207.7(a)(3)(B) and (C); 19 CFR 206.17(a)(3)(B) and (C). Economists and consultants who obtain access to BPI/CBI under the APO under the direction and control of an attorney nonetheless remain individually responsible for complying with the APO. In appropriate circumstances, for example, an economist under the direction and control of an attorney may be held responsible for a breach of the APO by failing to redact APO information from a document that is subsequently filed with the Commission and served as a public document. This is so even though the attorney exercising direction or control over the economist or consultant may also be

held responsible for the breach of the APO.

The records of Commission investigations of alleged APO breaches in antidumping and countervailing duty cases, section 337 investigations, and safeguard investigations are not publicly available and are exempt from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act, 5 U.S.C. 552. *See* 19 U.S.C. 1677f(g), 19 U.S.C. 1333(h).

The two types of breaches most frequently investigated by the Commission involve the APO's prohibition on the dissemination of BPI or CBI to unauthorized persons and the APO's requirement that the materials received under the APO be returned or destroyed and that a certificate be filed indicating which action was taken after the termination of the investigation or any subsequent appeals of the Commission's determination. The dissemination of BPI/CBI usually occurs as the result of failure to delete BPI/CBI from public versions of documents filed with the Commission or transmission of proprietary versions of documents to unauthorized recipients. Other breaches have included the failure to bracket properly BPI/CBI in proprietary documents filed with the Commission, the failure to report immediately known violations of an APO, and the failure to adequately supervise non-lawyers in the handling of BPI/CBI.

Occasionally, the Commission conducts APOB investigations that involve members of a law firm or consultants working with a firm who were granted access to APO materials by the firm although they were not APO signatories. In many of these cases, the firm and the person using the BPI mistakenly believed an APO application had been filed for that person. The Commission determined in all of these cases that the person who was a non-signatory, and therefore did not agree to be bound by the APO, could not be found to have breached the APO. Action could be taken against these persons, however, under Commission rule 201.15 (19 CFR 201.15) for good cause shown. In all cases in which action was taken, the Commission decided that the non-signatory was a person who appeared regularly before the Commission and was aware of the requirements and limitations related to APO access and should have verified his or her APO status before obtaining access to and using the BPI. The Commission notes that section 201.15 may also be available to issue sanctions to attorneys or agents in different factual circumstances in which they did not technically breach the APO, but when their actions or inactions did not

demonstrate diligent care of the APO materials even though they appeared regularly before the Commission and were aware of the importance the Commission placed on the care of APO materials.

Counsel have been cautioned to be certain that each authorized applicant files within 60 days of the completion of an import injury investigation or at the conclusion of judicial or binational review of the Commission's determination a certificate that to his or her knowledge and belief all copies of BPI/CBI have been returned or destroyed and no copies of such material have been made available to any person to whom disclosure was not specifically authorized. This requirement applies to each attorney, consultant, or expert in a firm who has been granted access to BPI/CBI. One firm-wide certificate is insufficient. This same information is also being added to notifications sent to new APO applicants.

In addition, attorneys who are signatories to the APO representing clients in a section 337 investigation should send a notice to the Commission if they stop participating in the investigation or the subsequent appeal of the Commission's determination. The notice should inform the Commission about the disposition of CBI obtained under the APO that was in their possession or they could be held responsible for any failure of their former firm to return or destroy the CBI in an appropriate manner.

III. Specific Investigations

APO Breach Investigations

Case 1

The Commission found that two attorneys and a legal assistant from a law firm breached the APO when they failed to remove business proprietary information (BPI) from the public version of final comments filed on behalf of their clients, who were respondents in a title VII investigation. The Commission issued a private letter of reprimand to all three individuals.

After the law firm filed the public version of its final comments, the Commission staff identified five instances of failure to redact BPI from brackets in that public document. The Commission Secretary notified the firm of that failure to redact and she sent a letter of inquiry to the firm. Two attorneys and a legal assistant provided responses describing their participation in preparation and filing of that public version. The Commission found that they had breached the APO, and allowed additional comments from the

attorneys and legal assistant on mitigating circumstances and their views on the appropriate sanction.

The Commission considered several mitigating circumstances. The record indicated that the breach was unintentional and none of the three individuals had been found in violation of an APO in the two years preceding the breach, the standard period the Commission has considered in sanctions determinations. After the breach was discovered by Commission staff, the firm took immediate steps to cure the breach, including retrieval from counsel who was not a signatory to the APO but upon whom the public version of the final comments had been served. The firm also immediately followed up with Commission staff to assure that the BPI was removed from the Electronic Document Information System (EDIS).

The Commission also took into account some aggravating factors. The breach was discovered by Commission staff and not the law firm. The BPI was available to the public for about a week, including on EDIS, and the document was in fact viewed on EDIS by the public. Also, one law firm which was not on the APO was served the public document containing BPI, thus making it likely that the BPI was read by persons not under the APO. In addition, the firm failed to follow its own procedures for protecting BPI by not using a third attorney to review the redaction of the BPI from the public version of the document.

Case 2

The Commission found that an attorney breached the APO by failing to serve all authorized applicants to the APO with written submissions containing business proprietary information, pursuant to the requirements of the APO and Commission Rule 207.7(f). The Commission issued a warning letter to the attorney.

Commission Rule 207.7(f) requires that all written submissions containing business proprietary information be served on all authorized applicants to the APO. The APO requires that all BPI materials be served pursuant to Commission rule 207.7. An attorney representing a respondent submitted foreign producer questionnaire responses to the Commission. In the accompanying cover letter, the attorney indicated that he had served the questionnaire responses on all authorized applicants except for a law firm representing two of the domestic interested parties. The attorney claimed that the firm was engaged in competitive decision making for its

clients and that the information being submitted was a type of information for which there was a clear and compelling need to withhold from disclosure.

Commission staff informed the attorney that he was required to serve the law firm in question by noon the next day or the questionnaires would be rejected. Since the attorney did not do so, the questionnaire responses were rejected.

The Commission considered several mitigating factors. The attorney involved had not been sanctioned for an APO breach within the two year period generally examined by the Commission for purposes of determining sanctions nor had he previously violated the Commission's rules. Moreover, no party was prejudiced by the breach as the attorney later filed the same questionnaire responses and served them on all authorized applicants, including the law firm not previously served.

The Commission also considered the aggravating circumstances that the APO breach was intentional and was caused by the attorney substituting his judgment for the Commission's as to which parties to serve.

Case 3

Attorneys who were APO signatories in two law firms were found by the Commission to have breached the APO in a section 337 investigation by retaining confidential business information (CBI) after the appeal of the investigation had terminated. Two of the attorneys breached the APO by retaining the CBI and by disclosing third party CBI to non-signatories in response to discovery requests in separate district

court litigation. Those two attorneys were issued private letters of reprimand by the Commission and the attorneys who had retained but not disclosed the CBI were issued warning letters. The Commission did not find a violation of the APO by attorneys in several other law firms who were not signatories to the APO but who received the CBI that had been disclosed by the two aforementioned attorneys. They were instead issued letters instructing them to return or destroy the CBI.

With respect to the attorneys who retained and disclosed the CBI, the Commission considered the mitigating circumstances that the breach was unintentional, that the attorneys acted quickly to cure the breach, and that they had not previously breached an APO within the two-year period generally considered by the Commission in determining what sanctions to impose for a breach. The Commission also took into account the aggravating circumstances that the CBI was viewed by unauthorized persons, and that the breach was not discovered by the attorneys or their firm.

With respect to the attorneys who retained but did not disclose the CBI, the Commission considered the mitigating circumstances that the breach was unintentional, that the CBI that they retained was not read by any person not subject to the APO, that their firm moved to remedy the breach expeditiously after being informed of it by the Commission staff, and that this is the only breach in which they had been involved in the two-year period generally examined by the Commission for the purpose of determining sanctions. The Commission also

considered the aggravating circumstances that their firm did not discover the breach and that it appeared that their firm had a policy to retain CBI following any case or investigation.

Issued: December 21, 2012.

By order of the Commission.

Lisa R. Barton,

Acting Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2012-31158 Filed 12-27-12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

MILLENNIUM CHALLENGE CORPORATION

[MCC FR 12-14]

Notice of Quarterly Report (July 1, 2012—September 30, 2012)

AGENCY: Millennium Challenge Corporation.

SUMMARY: The Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC) is reporting for the quarter July 1, 2012, through September 30, 2012, on assistance provided under section 605 of the Millennium Challenge Act of 2003 (22 U.S.C. 7701 *et seq.*), as amended (the Act), and on transfers or allocations of funds to other federal agencies under section 619(b) of the Act. The following report will be made available to the public by publication in the **Federal Register** and on the Internet Web site of the MCC (www.mcc.gov) in accordance with section 612(b) of the Act.

Dated: December 21, 2012.

T. Charles Cooper,

Vice President, Congressional and Public Affairs, Millennium Challenge Corporation.

Projects	Obligated	Objective	Cumulative disbursements	Measures ²
Country: Benin Year: 2012 Quarter 4 Total Obligation: \$301,810,356				
Entity to which the assistance is provided: MCA Benin			Total Quarterly Disbursements ¹ : \$81,539	
Access to Financial Services Project.	\$15,495,910	Expand access to financial services.	\$15,495,910	Value of credits granted by micro-finance institutions (MFIs) (at the national level). Value of savings collected by MFIs (at the national level). Average share of all outstanding loans with one or more installments 90 days overdue, among MFIs participating in the Challenge Facility. Operational self-sufficiency of MFIs at the national level. Institutions receiving grants through the established grant facility. MFIs inspected by Cellule Supervision Micro-finance.
Access to Justice Project	\$19,383,915	Improved ability of justice system to enforce contracts and reconcile claims.	\$19,383,915	Average time to enforce a contract. Percent of firms reporting confidence in the judicial system. Passage of new legal codes.