Dated: April 10, 2008.

Florence E. Harmon,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. E8–8182 Filed 4–16–08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010–01–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:

Rule 15g–9; SEC File No. 270–325 ; OMB Control No. 3235–0385.

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 comment on the collection of information described below. The Commission plans to submit this existing collection of information to the Office of Management and Budget for extension and approval.

Section 15(c)(2) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S. C. 78a et seq.) (the ''Exchange Act'') authorizes the Commission to promulgate rules that prescribe means reasonably designed to prevent fraudulent, deceptive, or manipulative practices in connection with over-the-counter (''OTC'') securities transactions. Pursuant to this authority, the Commission in 1989 adopted Rule 15a–6 (the ''Rule''), which was subsequently redesignated as Rule 15g–9, 17 CFR 240.15g–9. The Rule requires broker-dealers to produce a written suitability determination for, and to obtain a written customer agreement to, certain recommended transactions in low-priced stocks that are not registered on a national securities exchange or authorized for trading on NASDAQ, and whose issuers do not meet certain minimum financial standards. The Rule is intended to prevent the indiscriminate use by broker-dealers of fraudulent, high pressure telephone sales campaigns to sell low-priced securities to unsophisticated customers.

The Commission staff estimates that there are approximately 240 broker-dealers subject to the Rule. The burden of the Rule on a respondent varies widely depending on the frequency with which new customers are solicited. On the average for all respondents, the staff has estimated that respondents process three new customers per week, or approximately 156 new customer suitability determinations per year. We also estimate that a broker-dealer would expend approximately one-half hour per new customer in obtaining, reviewing, and processing (including transmitting to the customer) the information required by Rule 15g–9, and each respondent would consequently spend 78 hours annually (156 customers × .5 hours) obtaining the information required in the rule. We determined, based on the estimate of 240 broker-dealer respondents, that the current annual burden of Rule 15g–9 is 18,720 hours (240 respondents × 78 hours).

In addition, we estimate that if tangible communications alone are used to transmit the documents required by Rule 15g–9, each customer should take: (1) No more than eight minutes to review, sign and return the suitability determination document; and (2) no more than two minutes to either read and return or produce the customer agreement for a particular recommended transaction in penny stocks, listing the issuer and number of shares of the particular penny stock to be purchased, and send it to the broker-dealer. Thus, the total current customer respondent burden is approximately 10 minutes per response, for an aggregate total of 1,560 minutes for each broker-dealer respondent. Since there are 240 respondents, the annual burden for customer responses is 374,400 minutes (1,560 customer minutes per each of the 240 respondents) or 6,240 hours.

In addition, we estimate that, if tangible means of communications alone are used, broker-dealers could incur a recordkeeping burden under Rule 15g–9 of approximately two minutes per response. Since there are approximately 240 broker-dealer respondents and each respondent would have approximately 156 responses annually, respondents would incur an aggregate recordkeeping burden of 74,880 minutes (240 respondents × 156 responses × 2 minutes per response), or 1,248 hours. Accordingly, the aggregate annual hour burden associated with Rule 15g–9 is 26,208 hours (18,720 hours to prepare the suitability statement and agreement + 6,240 hours for customer review + 1,248 recordkeeping hours).

We recognize that under the amendments to Rule 15g–9, the burden hours may be slightly reduced if the transaction agreement required under the rule is provided through electronic means such as e-mail from the customer to the broker-dealer (*e.g.*, the customer may take only one minute, instead of the two minutes estimated above, to provide the transaction agreement by e-mail rather than regular mail). If each of the customer respondents estimated above communicates with his or her broker-dealer electronically, the total burden hours on the customers would be reduced from 10 minutes to 9 minutes per response, or an aggregate total of 1,404 minutes per respondent (156 customers × 9 minutes for each customer). Since there are 240 respondents, the annual customer respondent burden, if electronic communications were used by all customers, would be approximately 336,960 minutes (240 respondents × 1,404 minutes per each respondent), or 5,616 hours. We do not believe the hour burden on broker-dealers in obtaining, reviewing, and processing the suitability determination would change through use of electronic communications. In addition, we do not believe that, based on information currently available to us, recordkeeping burdens under Rule 15g–9 would change where the required documents were sent or received through means of electronic communication. Thus, if all broker-dealer respondents obtain and send the documents required under the rule electronically, the aggregate annual hour burden associated with Rule 15g–9 would be 25,584 hours (18,720 hours to prepare the suitability statement and agreement + 5,616 hours for customer review + 1,248 recordkeeping hours).

We cannot estimate how many broker-dealers and customers will choose to communicate electronically. If we assume that 50 percent of respondents would continue to provide documents and obtain signatures in tangible form, and 50 percent would choose to communicate electronically in satisfaction of the requirements of Rule 15g–9, the total aggregate hour burden would be 25,896 burden hours ((26,208 aggregate burden hours for documents and signatures in tangible form × 0.50 of the respondents = 13,104 hours) + (25,584 aggregate burden hours for electronically signed and transmitted documents × 0.50 of the respondents = 12,792 hours)).

Written comments are invited on: (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimates of the burden of the proposed collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information on respondents; 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.

Comments should be directed to: R. Corey Booth, Director/Chief Information Officer, Securities and Exchange Commission, C/O Shirley Martinson, 6432 General Green Way, Alexandria, Virginia 22312; or comments may be sent by e-mail to: *PRA_Mailbox@sec.gov*. Comments must be submitted within 60 days of this notice.

Dated: April 10, 2008.

Florence E. Harmon,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. E8–8183 Filed 4–16–08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010–01–P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Release No. 34–57649; File No. 4–551]

Program for Allocation of Regulatory Responsibilities Pursuant to Rule 17d–2; Notice of Filing and Order Approving and Declaring Effective an Amendment to the Plan for the Allocation of Regulatory Responsibilities Among the American Stock Exchange LLC, Boston Stock Exchange, Inc., Chicago Board Options Exchange, Incorporated, International Securities Exchange, LLC, Financial Industry Regulatory Authority, Inc., The NASDAQ Stock Market LLC, NYSE Arca, Inc., and Philadelphia Stock Exchange, Inc.

April 11, 2008.

Notice is hereby given that the Securities and Exchange Commission (''Commission'') has issued an Order, pursuant to Section 17(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (''Act''),[1] approving and declaring effective an amendment to the plan for allocating regulatory responsibility (''Plan'') filed pursuant to Rule 17d–2 of the Act,[2] by the American Stock Exchange LLC (''Amex''), Boston Stock Exchange, Inc. (''BSE''), Chicago Board Options Exchange, Incorporated (''CBOE''), International Securities Exchange, LLC (''ISE''), Financial Industry Regulatory Authority, Inc. (''FINRA''), The NASDAQ Stock Market LLC (''NASDAQ''), NYSE Arca, Inc. (''NYSE Arca''), and Philadelphia Stock Exchange, Inc. (''Phlx'') (collectively, ''SRO participants'') concerning options-related market surveillance.

I. Introduction

Section 19(g)(1) of the Act,[3] among other things, requires every self-regulatory organization (''SRO'') registered as either a national securities exchange or national securities association to examine for, and enforce compliance by, its members and persons associated with its members with the Act, the rules and regulations thereunder, and the SRO's own rules, unless the SRO is relieved of this responsibility pursuant to Section 17(d)[4] or Section 19(g)(2)[5] of the Act. Without this relief, the statutory obligation of each individual SRO could result in a pattern of multiple examinations of broker-dealers that maintain memberships in more than one SRO (''common members''). Such regulatory duplication would add unnecessary expenses for common members and their SROs.

Section 17(d)(1) of the Act[6] was intended, in part, to eliminate unnecessary multiple examinations and regulatory duplication.[7] With respect to a common member, Section 17(d)(1) authorizes the Commission, by rule or order, to relieve an SRO of the responsibility to receive regulatory reports, to examine for and enforce compliance with applicable statutes, rules, and regulations, or to perform other specified regulatory functions.

To implement Section 17(d)(1), the Commission adopted two rules: Rule 17d–1 and Rule 17d–2 under the Act.[8] Rule 17d–1 authorizes the Commission to name a single SRO as the designated examining authority (''DEA'') to examine common members for compliance with the financial responsibility requirements imposed by the Act, or by Commission or SRO rules.[9] When an SRO has been named as a common member's DEA, all other SROs to which the common member belongs are relieved of the responsibility to examine the firm for compliance with the applicable financial responsibility rules. On its face, Rule 17d–1 deals only with an SRO's obligations to enforce member compliance with financial responsibility requirements. Rule 17d–1 does not relieve an SRO from its obligation to examine a common member for compliance with its own rules and provisions of the federal securities laws governing matters other than financial responsibility, including sales practices and trading activities and practices.

To address regulatory duplication in these and other areas, the Commission adopted Rule 17d–2 under the Act.[10] Rule 17d–2 permits SROs to propose joint plans for the allocation of regulatory responsibilities with respect to their common members. Under paragraph (c) of Rule 17d–2, the Commission may declare such a plan effective if, after providing for notice and comment, it determines that the plan is necessary or appropriate in the public interest and for the protection of investors, to foster cooperation and coordination among the SROs, to remove impediments to, and foster the development of, a national market system and a national clearance and settlement system, and is in conformity with the factors set forth in Section 17(d) of the Act. Commission approval of a plan filed pursuant to Rule 17d–2 relieves an SRO of those regulatory responsibilities allocated by the plan to another SRO.

II. The Plan

On December 11, 2007, the Commission approved the Plan for allocating regulatory responsibilities pursuant to Rule 17d–2.[11] The Plan is designed to reduce regulatory duplication for common members by allocating regulatory responsibility for certain options-related market surveillance matters among the SRO participants.[12] Generally, under the current Plan, an SRO participant will

[1] 15 U.S.C. 78q(d).

[2] 17 CFR 240.17d–2.

[3] 15 U.S.C. 78s(g)(1).

[4] 15 U.S.C. 78q(d).

[5] 15 U.S.C. 78s(g)(2).

[6] 15 U.S.C. 78q(d)(1).

[7] *See* Securities Act Amendments of 1975, Report of the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs to Accompany S. 249, S. Rep. No. 94–75, 94th Cong., 1st Session 32 (1975).

[8] 17 CFR 240.17d–1 and 17 CFR 240.17d–2, respectively.

[9] *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 12352 (April 20, 1976), 41 FR 18808 (May 7, 1976).

[10] *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 12935 (October 28, 1976), 41 FR 49091 (November 8, 1976).

[11] *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 56941 (December 11, 2007), 72 FR 71723 (December 18, 2007) (File No. 4–551).

[12] The Plan is wholly separate from the multiparty options agreement made pursuant to Rule 17d–2 by and among Amex, BSE, CBOE, ISE, FINRA, New York Stock Exchange LLC, NASDAQ, NYSE Arca, and Phlx involving the allocation of regulatory responsibilities with respect to common members for compliance with common rules relating to the conduct of broker-dealers of accounts for listed options or index warrants entered into on December 1, 2006, and as may be amended from time to time. *See* Securities Exchange Act Release Nos. 55145 (January 22, 2007), 72 FR 3882 (January 26, 2007) (File No. S7–966), and 55532 (March 26, 2007), 72 FR 15729 (April 2, 2007) (File No. S7–966). *See also* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 57481 (March 12, 2008), 73 FR 14507 (March 18, 2008) (File No. S7–966) (approving an amendment which sought, among other things, to add NASDAQ as a participant to such agreement).