

and on one side-wall with the information specified in S5.5(e) through (i) according to the phase-in schedule specified in S7 of this standard. The markings must be placed between the maximum section width and the bead on at least one sidewall, unless the maximum section width of the tire is located in an area that is not more than one-fourth of the distance from the bead to the shoulder of the tire. If the maximum section width that falls within that area, those markings must appear between the bead and a point one-half the distance from the bead to the shoulder of the tire, on at least one sidewall. The markings must be in letters and numerals not less than 0.078 inches high and raised above or sunk below the tire surface not less than 0.015 inches . . .

(b) The tire size designation as listed in the documents and publications specified in S4.1.1 of this standard . . .

Summary of Michelin's Analysis: Michelin's original analysis stated its belief that while the noncompliant tires lack the marking "Extra Load" on the sidewall opposite of the full DOT TIN as required by FMVSS No. 139, it is inconsequential as it relates to motor vehicle safety for the following reasons:

1. The subject tires meet or exceed all applicable FMVSS performance standards.

2. Associated with the designation "Extra Load" is a higher maximum load and a possible higher maximum inflation pressure. Each of the subject tires has been marked on both sidewalls with a maximum load of 560 kg (1235 lbs) which, under the ETRTO standard, corresponds to an Extra Load (or Reinforced) tire of the size 205/45ZR17 and load index of 88. The maximum inflation pressure marked beneath each maximum load is 340 kPa (50 psi), which is consistent with an Extra Load tire.

3. Per FMVSS No. 139 and ETRTO standards, the marking "Extra Load" alerts the installer to the fact that the subject tire has a higher load carrying capacity than the standard load tire of the same dimension. In the absence of the "Extra Load" mark, an installer could fit the subject tire to a vehicle which requires a standard load tire. But since the subject tire has the performance capacity of an Extra Load tire, the load requirement of the standard load fitment would be exceeded.

4. The subject tire is also a directional tire for which there is no intended outboard sidewall, that is, the preferred direction of rotation is marked on the sidewall, and when the subject tires are mounted on a vehicle, the left side tires on the vehicle will show the full DOT TIN and no Extra Load designation after the tire size. While this may cause some confusion for the operator, the marked

maximum load capacity of 560 kg (1235 lbs) will be visible on the outboard facing sidewall of all four tires, and will confirm the same maximum load capacity of each fitted tire.

5. All other sidewall markings are consistent with the requirements of FMVSS No. 139 for a passenger category tire and the non-conformity of the subject tires has no impact on the load carrying capacity of the tire on a motor vehicle, nor on motor vehicle safety.

Michelin has additionally informed NHTSA that it has corrected future production and that all other tire labeling information is correct.

In the comment that Michelin posted to the petition docket, it contends that after further research that it now believes that a noncompliance does not exist and that its petition is consequently moot. Michelin based this belief on previous statements published by NHTSA that it contends show that "extra load" is an "optional load identification" and is therefore considered as separate from the mandatory "tire size designation."

In summation, Michelin believes that its original determination that there is a noncompliance in the subject tires as described in the subject petition was in error and that its petition, to exempt it from providing recall notification of noncompliance as required by 49 U.S.C. 30118 and remedying the recall noncompliance as required by 49 U.S.C. 30120 was unnecessary and should be considered to be moot.

NHTSA Decision: Inconsequential noncompliance petitions filed under 49 CFR part 556 are only valid in situations where there is a noncompliance with a FMVSS. In its comment to the petition docket, Michelin explained that its petition was submitted in error and should be considered as moot.

Based on Michelin's description of the subject tire molding error NHTSA has determined that the alleged tire sidewall labeling noncompliance described in the subject petition is not a noncompliance with FMVSS No. 139 or any other applicable FMVSS because the "extra load" label is an "optional load identification" and not a mandatory "tire size designation." Therefore, this petition is moot and no further action on the petition is warranted.

Authority: (49 U.S.C. 30118, 30120; Delegations of authority at CFR 1.95 and 501.8)

Issued On: August 7, 2013.

Claude H. Harris,
Director, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance.

[FR Doc. 2013-20235 Filed 8-19-13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-59-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Office of the Comptroller of the Currency

Agency Information Collection Activities: Revision of an Approved Information Collection; Comment Request

AGENCY: Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Treasury (OCC).

ACTION: Notice and request for comment.

SUMMARY: The OCC, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, invites the general public and other Federal agencies to comment on a revision to this information collection, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a respondent is not required to respond to, an information collection unless it displays a currently valid Office of Management and Budget (OMB) control number. Currently, the OCC is soliciting comment concerning a revision to a regulatory reporting requirement for national banks and Federal savings associations titled, "Company-Run Annual Stress Test Reporting Template and Documentation for Covered Institutions with Total Consolidated Assets of \$50 Billion or More under the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act."

DATES: Comments must be received by October 21, 2013.

ADDRESSES: Communications Division, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Mailstop 2-3, Attention: 1557-0311, 400 7th St. SW., Washington, DC 20219. In addition, comments may be sent by fax to (202) 874-5274 or by electronic mail to regs.comments@occ.treas.gov. You may personally inspect and photocopy comments at the OCC, 400 7th St. SW., Washington, DC 20219. For security reasons, the OCC requires that visitors make an appointment to inspect comments. You may do so by calling (202) 874-4700. Upon arrival, visitors will be required to present valid government-issued photo identification and to submit to security screening in order to inspect and photocopy comments.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: You can request additional information from Johnny Vilela or Mary H. Gottlieb, OCC Clearance Officers, (202) 649-5490, Legislative and Regulatory Activities Division, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, 400 7th St. SW., Washington, DC 20219. In addition, copies of the templates referenced in this notice can be found on the OCC's

Web site under News and Issuances (<http://www.occ.treas.gov/tools-forms/forms/bank-operations/stress-test-reporting.html>).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The OCC is requesting comment on the following revision to an approved information collection:

Title: Company-Run Annual Stress Test Reporting Template and Documentation for Covered Institutions with Total Consolidated Assets of \$50 Billion or More under the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act.

OMB Control No.: 1557–0311.

Description: Section 165(i)(2) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act¹ (Dodd-Frank Act) requires certain financial companies, including national banks and Federal savings associations, to conduct annual stress tests² and requires the primary financial regulatory agency³ of those financial companies to issue regulations implementing the stress test requirements.⁴ A national bank or Federal savings association is a “covered institution” and therefore subject to the stress test requirements if its total consolidated assets are more than \$10 billion. Under section 165(i)(2), a covered institution is required to submit to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System (Board) and to its primary financial regulatory agency a report at such time, in such form, and containing such information as the primary financial regulatory agency may require.⁵ On October 9, 2012, the OCC published in the **Federal Register** a final rule implementing the section 165(i)(2) annual stress test requirement.⁶ This rule describes the reports and information collections required to meet the reporting requirements under section 165(i)(2). These information collections will be given confidential treatment (5 U.S.C. 552(b)(4)).

In 2012, the OCC first implemented the reporting templates referenced in the final rule. See 77 FR 49485 (August 16, 2012) and 77 FR 66663 (November 6, 2012). The OCC is now revising them as described below.

The OCC intends to use the data collected to assess the reasonableness of the stress test results of covered institutions and to provide forward-looking information to the OCC regarding a covered institution’s capital

adequacy. The OCC also may use the results of the stress tests to determine whether additional analytical techniques and exercises could be appropriate to identify, measure, and monitor risks at the covered institution. The stress test results are expected to support ongoing improvement in a covered institution’s stress testing practices with respect to its internal assessments of capital adequacy and overall capital planning.

The OCC recognizes that many covered institutions with total consolidated assets of \$50 billion or more are required to submit reports using CCAR reporting form FR Y–14A.⁷ The OCC also recognizes the Board has a proposal to modify the FR Y–14A out for comment and, to the extent practical, the OCC will keep its reporting requirements consistent with the Board’s FR Y–14A in order to minimize burden on covered institutions.⁸ Therefore, the OCC is proposing to revise its reporting requirements to remain consistent with the Board’s proposed FR Y–14A for covered institutions with total consolidated assets of \$50 billion or more.

Proposed Revisions to Reporting Templates for Institutions With \$50 Billion or More in Assets

The proposed revisions to the DFAST–14A reporting templates consist of adding data items, deleting data items, and redefining existing data items. These proposed changes would (1) Provide additional information to greatly enhance the ability of the OCC to analyze the validity and integrity of firms’ projections, (2) improve comparability across firms, and (3) increase consistency between the FR Y–14A reporting templates and DFAST–14A reporting templates. The OCC has conducted a thorough review of proposed changes and believes that the incremental burden of these changes is justified given the need for these data to properly conduct the OCC’s supervisory responsibilities related to the stress testing.

Summary Schedule

The OCC proposes making a number of changes to the Summary Schedule to better assess covered institutions’ calculation of risk-weighted assets and certain other items detailed below.

Risk Weighted Assets (RWA) and Regulatory Capital Related to Basel III

On July 9, 2013, the OCC approved a joint final rule that will revise and

replace the OCC’s risk-based and leverage capital requirements to be consistent with agreements reached by the Basel Committee on Banking Supervision in “Basel III: A Global Regulatory Framework for More Resilient Banks and Banking Systems” (Basel III).⁹ The revisions include implementation of a new definition of regulatory capital, a new common equity tier 1 minimum capital requirement, a higher minimum tier 1 capital requirement, and, for banking organizations subject to the Advanced Approaches capital rules, a supplementary leverage ratio that incorporates a broader set of exposures in the denominator measure. In addition, the rule will amend the methodologies for determining risk-weighted assets and introduce disclosure requirements that would apply to top-tier banking organizations domiciled in the United States with \$50 billion or more in total assets.

Due to the timing of this proposal, the Dodd-Frank Act stress test, and the capital rulemaking, the OCC considered several options for the timing and scope of the proposal to collect information related to the proposed capital rulemaking. After careful consideration of the various options, the OCC determined that proposing the following revisions at this time would enable the OCC to collect these data while minimizing the burden to the industry.

Revisions to Capital Worksheet

To accommodate changes in the capital regime, the OCC proposes replacing the current Capital worksheet with three worksheets (General, Advanced Approaches, and Revised Capital worksheets) that incorporate the items of the current Capital worksheet and add or revise items to collect projections depending on which capital regime is applicable to the covered institution at any given point in the projection horizon. The General Capital worksheet would be required for all covered institutions for all projection quarters until the revised definition of capital becomes effective for the covered institution. The Advanced Approaches Capital worksheet would be required for covered institutions that have exited parallel run and are subject to the Advanced Approaches capital rules.

Proposed General Capital Worksheet

On the General Capital worksheet, the OCC proposes adding 9 line items that collect detail on the additions and adjustments to tier 1 capital that result

¹ Public Law 111–203, 124 Stat. 1376, July 2010.

² 12 U.S.C. 5365(i)(2)(A).

³ 12 U.S.C. 5301(12).

⁴ 12 U.S.C. 5365(i)(2)(C).

⁵ 12 U.S.C. 5365(i)(2)(B).

⁶ 77 FR 61238 (October 9, 2012).

⁷ <http://www.federalreserve.gov/reportforms>.

⁸ 78 FR 38033, June 25, 2013.

⁹ <http://www.occ.gov/news-issuances/news-releases/2013/nr-occ-2013-110.html>.

in the calculation of total risk-based capital under the general risk-based capital rules. The OCC also proposes revising the description of the item collecting data on taxes paid in previous years to refer to the current year, one year ago, and two years ago, instead of specific years.

Proposed Advanced Approaches Capital Worksheet

On the Advanced Approaches Capital worksheet, the OCC proposes adding or revising six items in the tier 1 capital section to collect data consistent with the definition of tier 1 capital under the Advanced Approaches Rule (12 CFR part 3, Appendix C). The OCC also proposes adding 13 items to collect detail on the additions and adjustments to tier 1 capital that result in the calculation of total risk-based capital.

Proposed Revised Capital Worksheet

On the Revised Capital worksheet, the OCC proposes revising 49 items under the header "Regulatory Capital" to collect data elements consistent with the Basel III definition of capital, as well as an associated "Exceptions Bucket" for information necessary to calculate certain deductions from capital. For all three Capital worksheets, the OCC proposes to add one item to confirm whether the filing institution is internationally active, which affects the calculation of deferred-tax assets.

Addition of RWA Worksheets

To accommodate the eventual collection of RWA as outlined in the rulemakings, the OCC proposes to add two RWA worksheets: RWA General and RWA Advanced. The items in the two worksheets correspond to the general risk-based capital rules and Standardized and Advanced Approaches. As proposed, the reporting requirements for these schedules would be as follows:

1. All covered institutions would be required to submit projections on the General worksheet for all projection quarters, where applicable. Covered institutions would be required to complete the General RWA section for all projection quarters until the Standardized Approach becomes the applicable risk-based capital requirement. At that time (January 1, 2014 for Advanced Approaches institutions, January 1, 2015 for all other covered institutions) institutions would be required to report items in the Standardized Approach section. The Memoranda for Derivative Contracts section would collect notional principal amounts by type of derivative contracts for all quarters.

2. Covered institutions subject to market risk capital requirements would be required to report items in the Market RWA section of the applicable RWA worksheet, using methodologies outlined in that rule.

3. Covered institutions that have exited parallel run prior to the beginning of DFAST 2014 will be required to submit projections on the Advanced Approaches RWA worksheet for all projection quarters.

4. Institutions that have exited parallel run which are subject to the Advances Approaches rule would be required to report items in the Advanced Approaches Credit Risk and Operational Risks sections for all quarters. These institutions would be required to report items in the Revised Advanced Approaches section for all applicable quarters and these institutions would still be required to complete the General RWA worksheet in order to calculate minimum risk-based capital requirements per the Advanced Approaches rule.

Proposed General RWA Worksheet

The proposed General RWA worksheet, which is composed of 69 items, would collect RWA as calculated under the general risk-based capital framework and the standardized approach, when applicable.

Proposed Advanced RWA Worksheet

The proposed Advanced RWA worksheet, which would be composed of 68 items, would collect RWA projections as calculated under the Advanced Approaches rule.

In addition to the above proposed changes to the Capital worksheet, the OCC proposes changes to several other worksheets in the Summary Schedule as described below.

Current Balance Sheet Worksheet

On the Balance Sheet worksheet, the OCC proposes adding two items to the Securities section, three items to the Other Assets section, two items to the Deposits section, and two items to the Liabilities section to better align this schedule with other regulatory reports to provide better insight into historical behavior of respondents' assets and liabilities. In addition, the OCC proposes to revise the definition of one item, Accumulated other comprehensive income (AOCI), in the covered institution equity capital section. This item would now be estimated by all covered institutions using the conditions specified in the applicable macroeconomic scenario, rather than under the trading shock.

Securities Available-For-Sale (AFS) Market Shock Worksheet

Consistent with the redefinition of AOCI in the balance sheet worksheet, the OCC proposes renaming this worksheet to Securities AFS OCI by Portfolio. This worksheet would collect quarterly projections of other comprehensive income (OCI) related to fair-value gains and losses on AFS securities that are based on the conditions specified in the applicable macroeconomic scenario.

PPNR Net Interest Income Worksheet

On the PPNR Net Interest Income worksheet, the OCC proposes redefining the information collected in this worksheet to include all assets, including nonaccrual loans which were previously reported in the PPNR metrics worksheet. Covered institutions would be expected to include in the supporting documentation a breakout of the major categories of nonaccrual loans relevant to their own institution. The OCC proposes expanding detail on covered institution holdings of securities to better understand the underlying dynamics of securities balances and interest income by breaking out data items for Treasury and Agency debt, residential mortgage-backed securities issued by government agencies, and all other securities. Similarly, the OCC proposes redefining the information collected in this worksheet to include all liability balances and adding one item to capture other liabilities that fall outside the existing liability types reported.

To reduce burden on reporting institutions, the existing breakout of commercial and industrial loans into small business loans and other loans would be collapsed into one item.

PPNR Metrics Worksheet

Where applicable, the aforementioned changes to the PPNR Net Interest Income worksheet would also be reflected in the PPNR Metrics worksheet. In addition, the OCC would modify, delete, and add several items to better understand how PPNR projections compare to historical trends.

Finally, the OCC proposes adding four footnote items to allow the OCC to better assess covered institution PPNR projections. Outside of the worksheets named above, the OCC is proposing minor changes to the Balance Sheet, Retail Balance & Loss Projections, Securities OTTI Methodology, Securities OTTI by Portfolio, Securities AFS Market Shock, Securities Market Value Sources, OpRisk, and PPNR Projections worksheets.

Basel III Schedule

The OCC proposes adding a line item to the Capital Composition worksheet to capture deductions related to insurance underwriting subsidiaries, which will enable more precise calculations of regulatory capital. The OCC also proposes revising the General and Advanced Approaches RWA worksheets to align with certain changes made to the Summary Schedule. Specifically, the OCC proposes adding to the General RWA worksheet a "RWA per Standardized Approach" section, which would collect credit RWA using methodologies under the revised standardized approach.

Counterparty Schedule

The OCC proposes eliminating the aggregate worksheets EE Profile by Ratings and Credit Quality by Rating from the Counterparty Schedule and expanding the collection of the counterparty specific worksheets CP CVA by Top 200 CVA, EE Profile by CP, and Credit Quality by CP to capture the top counterparties that account for 95% of credit valuation adjustment (CVA). This expansion in scope is driven by the need to close the sometimes significant gap between the CVA of the top 200 counterparties and the covered institution's total CVA and to capture exposures to counterparties that are significantly large in other dimensions, but which are currently excluded from the top 200 by CVA. Additionally, the OCC proposes adding an additional worksheet that collects the top 20 counterparties by Securities Financing Transactions and Repo exposure to account for counterparty exposures other than derivatives. Finally, the OCC proposes adding columns on the worksheets of the template as appropriate to collect stressed counterparty data based on the Adverse and Severely Adverse scenarios as part of the stress testing process. In addition, the OCC proposes amending the scope of the respondents to the DFAST-14A CCR schedule and Trading and CCR worksheets of the DFAST-14A Summary schedule to include any company that the OCC may require to complete these schedules under 12 CFR 46.4.

Type of Review: Revision.

Affected Public: Businesses or other for-profit.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 20.

Estimated Total Annual Burden: 9,600 hours.

The OCC recognizes that the Board has estimated 67,021 hours for bank holding companies to prepare the

Summary, Counterparty credit risk, Basel III and Capital reporting schedules submitted for the FR Y-14. The OCC believes that the systems covered institutions use to prepare the FR Y-14 reporting templates will also be used to prepare the reporting templates described in this notice. Comments submitted in response to this notice will be summarized and included in the request for OMB approval. All comments will become a matter of public record. Comments are invited on:

(a) Whether the collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the OCC, including whether the information has practical utility;

(b) The accuracy of the OCC's estimate of the burden of the collection of information;

(c) Ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected;

(d) Ways to minimize the burden of the collection on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology; and

(e) Estimates of capital or start-up costs and costs of operation, maintenance, and purchase of services to provide information.

Dated: August 15, 2013.

Michele Meyer,

Assistant Director, Legislative and Regulatory Activities Division.

[FR Doc. 2013-20247 Filed 8-19-13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4810-33-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY**Internal Revenue Service****Members of Senior Executive Service Performance Review Boards**

AGENCY: Internal Revenue Service (IRS), Department of the Treasury (Treasury).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The purpose of this notice is to publish the names of those IRS employees who will serve as members on IRS's Fiscal Year 2013 Senior Executive Service (SES) Performance Review Boards.

DATES: This notice is effective September 1, 2013.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Debbie Salisbury, IRS, 1111 Constitution Avenue NW., Room 2410, Washington, DC 20224, (202) 622-4116.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 4314(c)(4), this notice announces the appointment of members to the IRS's SES Performance Review Boards. The names and titles of the

executives serving on the boards are as follows:

Elizabeth Tucker, Deputy Commissioner for Operations Support

David P. Alito, Deputy Commissioner for Operations, Wage and Investment (W&I)

Peggy A. Bogadi, Commissioner, Wage and Investment (W&I)

Lauren Buschor, Associate Chief Information Officer (CIO), Enterprise Operations, Information Technology (IT)

Carol A. Campbell, Director, Return Preparer Office, Deputy Commissioner for Services and Enforcement (DCSE)

Robin L. Canady, Director, Strategy and Finance (W&I)

Daniel B. Chaddock, Associate CIO, Enterprise Services (IT)

Rebecca A. Chiamida, Director, Privacy, Governmental Liaison and Disclosure (PGLD)

James P. Clifford, Director, Compliance (W&I)

Debra A. Cunn, Executive Director, Business Modernization, Taxpayer Advocate Service (TAS)

Monica H. Davy, Executive Director, Office of Equity, Diversity and Inclusion, Office of the Commissioner

Paul D. DeNard, Deputy Commissioner, Domestic, Large Business and International (LB&I)

Faris R. Fink, Commissioner, Small Business/Self-Employed (SB/SE)

David M. Fisher, Chief Risk Officer and Senior Advisor to the Commissioner, Office of the Commissioner

Carl T. Froehlich, Associate CIO, Strategy and Planning (IT)

Julietta Garcia, Director, Customer Assistance, Relationships and Education (W&I)

Silvana G. Garza, Deputy CIO, Operations (IT)

Rena C. Girinakis, Executive Director, Systemic Advocacy (TAS)

William T. Grams, Chief of Staff, Office of the Commissioner

David A. Grant, Chief, Agency-Wide Shared Services (AWSS)

Darren J. Guillot, Director, Enterprise Collection Strategy (SB/SE)

Patricia J. Haynes, Deputy Chief Criminal Investigation, Criminal Investigation (CI)

Shenita L. Hicks, Director, Examination (SB/SE)

Debra S. Holland, Deputy Commissioner for Support (W&I)

Robert L. Hunt, Director, Collection (SB/SE)

Robin DelRey Jenkins, Director, Office of Business Modernization (SB/SE)

Michael D. Julianelle, Deputy Commissioner, Tax Exempt and Government Entities (TEGE)