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DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Food and Nutrition Service

7 CFR Parts 210 and 220

[FNS–2007–0038]
RIN 0584–AD59
Nutrition Standards in the National School Lunch and School Breakfast Programs; Approval of Information Collection Request

AGENCY: Food and Nutrition Service, USDA.
ACTION: Final rule; approval of information collection request.

SUMMARY: The Food and Nutrition Service published a final rule entitled “Nutrition Standards in the National School Lunch and School Breakfast Programs” on January 26, 2012. The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) cleared the associated information collection requirements (ICR) on February 1, 2013. This document announces approval of the ICR.

DATES: The ICR associated with the final rule published in the Federal Register on January 26, 2012 at 77 FR 4088 was approved by OMB on February 1, 2013, under OMB Control Number 0584–0006.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Requests for additional information or copies of this information collection should be directed to Jon Garcia, Program Analysis and Monitoring Branch, Child Nutrition Division, 3101 Park Center Drive, Alexandria, VA 22302.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The February 22, 2013 final rule amended the National School Lunch Program (NSLP) regulations to incorporate provisions of the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010 designed to encourage States to improve direct certification efforts with the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP). The provisions require State agencies to meet certain direct certification performance benchmarks and to develop and implement continuous improvement plans if they fail to do so. The final rule also amended NSLP and SNAP regulations to provide for the collection of data elements needed to compute each State’s direct certification performance rate to compare with the new benchmarks. Improved direct certification efforts will help increase program accuracy, reduce paperwork for States and households, and increase eligible children’s access to school meals. The proposed rule took comments on the associated ICR until April 2, 2012. This document announces OMB’s approval of the ICR under OMB Control Number 0584–0577.

Dated: June 26, 2013.
Audrey Rowe,
Administrator, Food and Nutrition Service.

BILLING CODE P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Food and Nutrition Service

7 CFR Parts 245 and 272

RIN 0584–AE10
National School Lunch Program: Direct Certification Continuous Improvement Plans Required by the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010; Approval of Information Collection Request

AGENCY: Food and Nutrition Service, USDA.
ACTION: Final rule; approval of information collection request.

SUMMARY: The Food and Nutrition Service published a final rule entitled “National School Lunch Program: Direct Certification Continuous Improvement Plans Required by the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010” on February 22, 2013. The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) cleared the associated information collection requirements (ICR) on April 10, 2013. This document announces approval of the ICR.

DATES: The ICR associated with the final rule published in the Federal Register on February 22, 2013 at 78 FR 12221 was approved by OMB on April 10, 2013, under OMB Control Number 0584–0577.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Requests for additional information or copies of this information collection should be directed to Jon Garcia, Program Analysis and Monitoring Branch, Child Nutrition Division, 3101 Park Center Drive, Alexandria, VA 22302.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The February 22, 2013 final rule amended the National School Lunch Program (NSLP) regulations to incorporate provisions of the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010 designed to encourage States to improve direct certification efforts with the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP). The provisions require State agencies to meet certain direct certification performance benchmarks and to develop and implement continuous improvement plans if they fail to do so. The final rule also amended NSLP and SNAP regulations to provide for the collection of data elements needed to compute each State’s direct certification performance rate to compare with the new benchmarks. Improved direct certification efforts will help increase program accuracy, reduce paperwork for States and households, and increase eligible children’s access to school meals. The proposed rule took comments on the associated ICR until April 2, 2012. This document announces OMB’s approval of the ICR under OMB Control Number 0584–0577.

Dated: June 26, 2013.
Audrey Rowe,
Administrator, Food and Nutrition Service.

BILLING CODE 3410–30–P

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

11 CFR Part 104

[Notice 2013–09]

Reporting Ultimate Payees of Political Committee Disbursements

AGENCY: Federal Election Commission.
ACTION: Notice of interpretive rule.

SUMMARY: The Federal Election Commission is clarifying its interpretation of the regulatory requirement that political committees
report the full name and address of each person to whom they make expenditures or other disbursements aggregating more than $200 per calendar year, or per election cycle for authorized committees, and the date, amount, and purpose of such payments, in three situations: A political committee reimburses an individual who advanced personal funds to pay committee expenses aggregating more than $200 to a single vendor; a political committee pays a credit card bill that includes a charge of more than $200 for a single vendor; and a candidate uses personal funds to pay his or her authorized committee’s expenses that aggregate more than $200 to a single vendor without receiving reimbursement.

DATES: July 8, 2013.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Amy L. Rothstein, Assistant General Counsel, or Joanna S. Waldstreicher, Attorney, 999 E Street NW., Washington, DC 20463. (202) 694–1650 or (800) 424–9530.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Political committees must report the name and address of each person to whom they make expenditures or other disbursements aggregating more than $200 per calendar year, or per election cycle for authorized committees, as well as the date, amount, and purpose of such payments. 2 U.S.C. 434(b)(5), (6); 11 CFR 104.3(b)(3)(i); (vii) (unauthorized committees); 11 CFR 104.5(b)(4)(i); (vi) (authorized committees); see also 11 CFR 104.9(a), (b).

The Commission published a draft Notice on January 31, 2013, to seek comment on a proposed interpretative rule to clarify these requirements as they apply to the reporting of certain itemized disbursements by political committees to vendors. The Commission received four comments: Two opposed the draft; one supported the draft with a request that the Commission impose an additional reporting requirement; and one resubmitted the comment supporting the draft without itself opining on the draft. Taking those comments into consideration the Commission now issues this Notice to clarify its interpretation of 11 CFR 104.3(b)(3)(i), (vii); 11 CFR 104.3(b)(4)(i), (vi); and 11 CFR 104.9(a), (b). These clarifications are made to the reporting requirements contained in these Commission regulations and implicate no other regulations than those referenced above.

Specifically, this Notice clarifies how a political committee should report disbursements in the following scenarios:

1. The committee reimburses an individual (such as a campaign staffer) who used personal funds to pay committee expenses aggregating more than $200 to a single vendor;
2. The committee’s payment of its credit card bill includes charges of more than $200 to a single vendor; and
3. The committee is the authorized committee of a candidate who used personal funds to pay committee expenses aggregating more than $200 to a single vendor without receiving reimbursement.

As explained further below, in each scenario the political committee will satisfy the reporting requirements by itemizing as a memo entry on Schedule B the name and address of the original vendor, as well as the date, amount, and purpose of the original purchase made for or by the political committee. The Commission makes clear that this interpretation is based on long-standing Commission practice and is not making any fundamental changes to its rules or processes. Further, the Commission is only addressing the three issues at hand and is not extending the clarification to situations in which a vendor, acting as the committee’s agent, purchases goods and services on the committee’s behalf from subvendors. The relationship between committees and its vendors raises different issues than the relationships that exist in these three circumstances.

2. Payments to Credit Card Companies

Any political committee that itemizes disbursements to credit card companies on Schedule B of its report filed with the Commission must itemize as a memo entry any transaction with a single vendor charged on the credit card that exceeds the $200 itemization threshold. The memo entry must include the name and address of the vendor, and the date, amount, and purpose of the charge. Itemizing the ultimate payee, as the provider of goods or services to the political committee, rather than the credit card company, for reimbursements to a political committee, rather than the credit card company, accurately reflects the credit card company’s limited role as a payment processor to the ultimate payee. Further, the Commission’s Report Analysis Division Review and Referential Procedures for the 2011–2012 Election Cycle, p. 98 ([http://www.fec.gov/pdf/RAD_Procedures.pdf](http://www.fec.gov/pdf/RAD_Procedures.pdf)), which is approved by the Commission for every two-year election cycle. Further, the Commission’s Reports Analysis Division has been sending Requests for Additional Information to authorized committees that did not itemize the ultimate payee for reimbursements to staff above the applicable thresholds since the 1983–1984 election cycle. Similarly, the Reports Analysis Division has been sending Requests for Additional Information to party and non-party committees that did not itemize the ultimate payee for reimbursements to staff above the applicable thresholds since the 2005–2006 election cycle after internal review procedures for authorized and unauthorized committees were merged. However, a grace period for calendar year 2005 was provided to party and non-party committees to allow for the development of administrative tracking systems.

---

2 This clarification is consistent with the Commission’s Report Analysis Division Review and Referential Procedures for the 2011–2012 Election Cycle, p. 98 ([http://www.fec.gov/pdf/RAD_Procedures.pdf](http://www.fec.gov/pdf/RAD_Procedures.pdf)), which is approved by the Commission for every two-year election cycle. Further, the Commission’s Reports Analysis Division has been sending Requests for Additional Information to authorized committees that did not itemize the ultimate payee for reimbursements to staff above the applicable thresholds since the 1983–1984 election cycle. Similarly, the Reports Analysis Division has been sending Requests for Additional Information to party and non-party committees that did not itemize the ultimate payee for reimbursements to staff above the applicable thresholds since the 2005–2006 election cycle after internal review procedures for authorized and unauthorized committees were merged. However, a grace period for calendar year 2005 was provided to party and non-party committees to allow for the development of administrative tracking systems.
provisions of the Regulatory Flexibility Act, which apply when notice and comment are required by the Administrative Procedure Act or another statute, do not apply. See 5 U.S.C. 603(a).

Dated: June 27, 2013.
On behalf of the Commission.
Ellen L. Weintraub,
Chair, Federal Election Commission.
[FR Doc. 2013-16125 Filed 7-5-13; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6715-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

U.S. Customs and Border Protection

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

19 CFR Part 12, 163, and 178


RIN 1515–AD85

Prohibitions and Conditions on the Importation and Exportation of Rough Diamonds

AGENCIES: U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security; Department of the Treasury.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This document amends the U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) regulations to set forth the prohibitions and conditions that are applicable to the importation and exportation of rough diamonds pursuant to the Clean Diamond Trade Act, as implemented by the President in Executive Order 13312 dated July 29, 2003, and the Rough Diamonds Control Regulations (RDCR) issued by the Office of Foreign Assets Control of the U.S. Department of the Treasury. In addition to restating pertinent provisions of the RDCR, the amendments clarify that any U.S. person exporting from, or importing to, the United States a shipment of rough diamonds must retain for a period of at least five years a copy of the Kimberley Process Certificate that currently must accompany such shipments and make the copy available for inspection when requested by CBP. The document also requires formal entry for shipments of rough diamonds.

DATES: Effective August 7, 2013.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Brian Barulich, Regulations and Rulings, Office of International Trade, (202) 325–0059.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

3 This clarification is consistent with the Commission’s Report Analysis Division Review and Referral Procedures for the 2011–2012 Election Cycle, p. 96 (http://www.fec.gov/pdf/RAD_Procedures.pdf). Similarly with reimbursements to committee staff, the Commission’s Reports Analysis Division has been sending Requests for Additional Information to authorized committees that did not provide memo entries for credit card payments above the applicable thresholds since the 1983–1984 election cycle.

4 Unlike the former two circumstances, this scenario is not addressed in the Commission’s Reports Analysis Division Review and Referral Procedures for the 2011–2012 Election Cycle that has been made public with redactions. Although the Reports Analysis Division will initiate a regular practice of sending Requests for Additional Information for failure to itemize the vendor for candidate out-of-pocket expenditures on behalf of his or her authorized committee, this portion of the interpretation rule will be applied prospectively. The adequacy of the responses to Requests for Additional Information on this issue will only be judged for those sent after the adoption of this interpretive rule.