

accountant inclined to test the bounds of professional conduct may have previously perceived loopholes or ambiguity for exploitation under the generally-stated standard of rule 14.8(c), the clarifying amendment provides a deterrent against such potentially damaging conduct—a benefit for market participants and the public. Further, such clear, specific notice forecloses to a great degree potential for an offending accounting practitioner, in defense of improper conduct, to argue confusion or uncertainty about what specifically the Commission's standard requires, thus supporting Commission enforcement efficiency.

The Commission anticipates no material cost burden attributable to the amendment for market participants or accounting professionals to whom the amendment is addressed. Again, this amendment merely articulates with more precision the contours of the more generally-stated standard of rule 14.8(c) as it has existed prior to this amendment; further, this pre-existing standard has encompassed standards governing the accounting profession generally and with which accounting professionals have needed to comply. Since the clarifying amendment effects no substantive change to the rule 14.8 standard, accountants practicing before the Commission should already be in compliance. Consequently, they should experience no cost to change their behavior to comply with the rule as amended.

In the following, the Commission considers the amendment relative to the CEA section 15(a) factors.

#### (1) Protection of Market Participants and the Public

As noted, improper accounting practices may help to cover up financial frauds or foster improper managerial decisions and may pose a threat to the safety of customer funds. By articulating the Commission's standards in more specific, codified, and readily accessible form, the amendment safeguards against accountants professing lack of knowledge of the applicable standards—or exploiting perceived ambiguities in them—to the detriment of market participants and the public.

#### (2) Efficiency, Competitiveness, and Financial Integrity of Futures Markets

Threats to the safety of customer funds generate public distrust in financial market integrity. To the extent this rule amendment better informs accountants and fosters their understanding of the Commission's standards and the consequences of improper actions—actions that

potentially could threaten the safety of customer funds—the amendment promotes the integrity of financial markets.

#### (3) Price Discovery

The Commission does not foresee that the amendment will directly impact price discovery.

#### (4) Sound Risk Management Practices

As noted, improper accounting practices may lead to unnecessary risks being undertaken, as certain risk measures or managerial decisions are based on accounting data. To the extent the amendment improves accountants' understanding of the Commission's standards, thereby deterring improper conduct that potentially could result in unnecessary risks being undertaken, the amendment promotes sound risk management practices.

#### (5) Other Public Interest Considerations

By harmonizing the rule 14.8(c) standard for accountants with that of SEC rule of practice 102(e), the amendment helps to ensure consistency and reduces potential for confusion.

#### List of Subjects in 17 CFR Part 14

Administrative practice and procedure, Professional conduct and competency standards, Ethical conduct, Penalties.

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Commodity Futures Trading Commission amends 17 CFR part 14 as set forth below:

### PART 14—RULES RELATING TO SUSPENSION OR DISBARMENT FROM APPEARANCE AND PRACTICE

■ 1. The authority citation for part 14 is revised to read as follows:

**Authority:** Pub. L. 93–463, sec. 101(a)(11), 88 Stat. 1391, 7 U.S.C. 4a(j).

■ 2. Amend § 14.8 by revising paragraph (c) to read as follows:

#### § 14.8 Lack of requisite qualifications, character and integrity.

\* \* \* \* \*

(c) To have engaged in unethical or improper professional conduct either in the course of any adjudicatory, investigative or rulemaking or other proceeding before the Commission or otherwise. With respect to the professional conduct of persons licensed to practice as accountants, “unethical or improper professional conduct” means:

(1) Intentional or knowing conduct, including reckless conduct, that results in a violation of applicable professional principles or standards; or

(2) Either of the following two types of negligent conduct:

(i) A single instance of highly unreasonable conduct that results in a violation of applicable professional principles or standards in circumstances in which an accountant knows, or should know, that heightened scrutiny is warranted.

(ii) Repeated instances of unreasonable conduct, each resulting in a violation of applicable professional principles or standards, which indicate a lack of competence to practice before the Commission.

Issued in Washington, DC, on June 5, 2015, by the Commission.

**Christopher J. Kirkpatrick,**  
*Secretary of the Commission.*

**Note:** The following appendix will not appear in the Code of Federal Regulations.

#### Appendix to Proceedings Before the Commodity Futures Trading Commission; Rules Relating to Suspension or Disbarment From Appearance and Practice—Commission Voting Summary

On this matter, Chairman Massad and Commissioners Wetjen, Bowen, and Giancarlo voted in the affirmative. No Commissioner voted in the negative.

[FR Doc. 2015–14159 Filed 6–9–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6351-01-P

### FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

#### 47 CFR Part 64

[CG Docket No. 10–210; FCC 15–57]

#### Relay Services for Deaf-Blind Individuals

**AGENCY:** Federal Communications Commission.

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** In this document, the Commission extends the National Deaf-Blind Equipment Distribution Program (NDBEDP) as a pilot program for one additional year. The NDBEDP provides up to \$10 million annually to support programs that distribute communications equipment to low-income individuals who are deaf-blind. Extending the pilot program enables the NDBEDP to continue providing communications equipment to low-income individuals who are deaf-blind without interruption while the Commission considers whether to adopt rules to govern a permanent NDBEDP.

**DATES:** Effective June 10, 2015.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Rosaline Crawford, Consumer and

Governmental Affairs Bureau, Disability Rights Office, at 202–418–2075 or email [Rosaline.Crawford@fcc.gov](mailto:Rosaline.Crawford@fcc.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** This is a summary of the Commission's document FCC 15–57, Implementation of the Twenty-First Century Communications and Video Accessibility Act of 2010, Section 105, Relay Services for Deaf-Blind Individuals, Order (*Order*), adopted on May 21, 2015 and released on May 27, 2015, in CG Docket No. 10–210. The full text of document FCC 15–57 will be available for public inspection and copying via the Commission's Electronic Comment Filing System (ECFS), through the Commission's Web site at <http://fjallfoss.fcc.gov/ecfs2/>, and during regular business hours at the FCC Reference Information Center, Portals II, 445 12th Street SW., Room CY–A257, Washington, DC 20554. Document FCC 15–57 can also be downloaded in Word or Portable Document Format (PDF) at <http://www.fcc.gov/ndbedp>. To request materials in accessible formats for people with disabilities (Braille, large print, electronic files, audio format), send an email to [fcc504@fcc.gov](mailto:fcc504@fcc.gov) or call the Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau at 202–418–0530 (voice), 202–418–0432 (TTY).

## Synopsis

### I. Background

1. Section 105 of the Twenty-First Century Communications and Video Accessibility Act of 2010 (CVAA) added section 719 to the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, which directed the Commission to establish rules to provide up to \$10 million annually from the Interstate Telecommunications Relay Service Fund (TRS Fund) to support programs that distribute communications equipment to low-income individuals who are deaf-blind. Public Law 111–260, 124 Stat. 2751 (2010); Public Law 111–265, 124 Stat. 2795 (2010); 47 U.S.C. 620. In 2011, the Commission established the NDBEDP as a two-year pilot program, with an option to extend it for an additional year. *Implementation of the Twenty-First Century Communications and Video Accessibility Act of 2010, Section 105, Relay Services for Deaf-Blind Individuals*, CG Docket No. 10–210, Report and Order, published at 76 FR 26641, May 9, 2011 (*NDBEDP Pilot Program Order*); 47 CFR 64.610 (NDBEDP pilot program rules). The Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau (CGB or Bureau) launched the pilot program on July 1, 2012. To implement the program, the Bureau

certified 53 entities to participate in the NDBEDP—one entity to distribute communications equipment in each state, plus the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands, hereinafter referred to as “state programs” or “certified programs”—and selected a national outreach coordinator to support the outreach and distribution efforts of these state programs. On February 7, 2014, the Bureau extended the pilot program for a third year, until June 30, 2015. Many individuals who have received equipment and training through the NDBEDP have reported that this program has vastly improved their daily lives, significantly enhancing their ability to live independently and expanding their educational and employment opportunities.

2. On August 1, 2014, the Bureau released a Public Notice inviting comment on which rules governing the NDBEDP pilot program should be retained and which should be modified to make the permanent NDBEDP more effective and more efficient. *Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau Seeks Comment on the National Deaf-Blind Equipment Distribution Program*, CG Docket No. 10–210, Public Notice, 29 FCC Rcd 9451 (CGB 2014). In response to the Public Notice, the Commission received over 40 comments from disability organizations, certified programs, and individual consumers, which will help to inform the preparation of a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking to establish a permanent NDBEDP when the pilot program ends.

### II. Extension of Pilot Program

3. In the *Order*, the Commission extends the existing NDBEDP pilot program rules for one additional year, until June 30, 2016. As noted in the *Order*, the Commission has sought comment on whether certain changes should be made when the NDBEDP transitions from a pilot to a permanent program. Completion of this rulemaking and implementation of any new rules may take longer than June 30, 2015, when the rules governing the NDBEDP pilot program will expire. Extending the pilot program will provide time to receive and thoroughly consider public input on proposed rules for a permanent program, as well as to implement final rules for the permanent NDBEDP without interrupting the distribution of communications equipment and provision of related services to low-income individuals who are deaf-blind, which the Commission finds serves the public interest. The extension will also provide greater programmatic certainty to entities that are currently certified to participate in the NDBEDP and enable

the Commission to provide a smooth transition from the NDBEDP pilot program to a permanent program. The Commission commits to continue the pilot NDBEDP as long as necessary to ensure a seamless transition between the pilot and permanent programs to ensure the uninterrupted distribution of equipment to this target population. When the Commission adopts final rules for the permanent program, it will consider the extent to which the pilot program needs to be extended further. To provide reasonable notice to the certified programs operating under the pilot program rules prior to June 30, 2015, this extension of the pilot program rules shall be effective June 10, 2015.

### *Final Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 Analysis*

The Commission currently has an Office and Management and Budget (OMB) collection 3060–1146 pending OMB's review and approval of an extension submitted to OMB on April 22, 2015. This collection contains information collection requirements for the NDBEDP pilot program, which are subject to the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) of 1995. Public Law 104–13. However, document FCC 15–57 does not modify the existing information collection requirements contained in OMB collection 3060–1146, and it does not contain new or modified information collection requirements subject to the PRA. In addition, therefore, it does not contain any new or modified information collection burden for small business concerns with fewer than 25 employees, pursuant to the Small Business Paperwork Relief Act of 2002. Public Law 107–198. *See also* 44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(4).

### *Congressional Review Act*

The Commission will not send a copy of FCC 15–57 pursuant to the Congressional Review Act, because the Commission adopted no rules therein. *See* 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A). Rather than adopting rules, the Commission exercised its statutory authority to extend the NDBEDP as a pilot program by *Order* for one additional year.

### Ordering Clause

Pursuant to the authority contained in sections 1, 4(i), 4(j), and 719 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. 151, 154(i), 154(j), and 620, that document FCC 15–57 *is adopted*.

Federal Communications Commission.

**Marlene H. Dortch,**

*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 2015-13717 Filed 6-9-15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-P

## OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

### 48 CFR Parts 1602, 1615, and 1652

RIN 3206-AN00

#### Federal Employees Health Benefits Program; Rate Setting for Community- Rated Plans

**AGENCY:** U.S. Office of Personnel  
Management.

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** The U.S. Office of Personnel Management (OPM) is issuing a final rule that makes changes to the Federal Employees Health Benefits Acquisition Regulation (FEHBAR). These changes: define which subscriber groups may be included for consideration as similarly sized subscriber groups (SSSGs); require the SSSG to be traditional community rated; establish that traditional community rated (TCR) Federal Employees Health Benefits (FEHB) plans must select only one rather than two SSSGs; and make conforming changes to FEHB contract language to account for the new medical loss ratio (MLR) standard for most community rated FEHB plans.

**DATES:** *Effective Date:* July 10, 2015.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Wenqiong Fu, Policy Analyst, at [wenqiong.fu@opm.gov](mailto:wenqiong.fu@opm.gov) or (202) 606-0004.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The U.S. Office of Personnel Management is issuing a final rule to update the Federal Employees Health Benefits Acquisition Regulation to accommodate the new FEHB specific medical loss ratio (MLR) requirement for most community rated plans as well as to update the similarly sized subscriber group (SSSG) requirement for traditional community rated plans.

#### Comments on FEHB Premium Impacts

OPM received a comment regarding the impact the regulation will have on future premiums in the FEHB Program. Based on the analysis, OPM does not believe that there will be a significant impact in aggregate on the entire FEHBP, and as such, it is unlikely that there will be any major substantive impacts on future premium increases in the FEHBP as a whole.

#### Comment on Traditional Community Rating Plans on FEHB Groups

A commenter raised a concern that, by utilizing TCR plans, OPM may potentially cost the government more money. The commenter's justification was that insurers will adjust rates to the highest expected rate if they have to provide the same rates to all groups. Traditional Community Rating is guided by state law and all groups pay the average cost of coverage for the community. As such, it is not believed plans will adjust rates to the highest expected rate.

#### Comments on Recommended Language

A commenter suggested that (1) OPM should exclude customers of carrier subsidiaries from SSSG consideration and (2) OPM should also exclude from SSSG analysis "[an] entity that maintains a contractual arrangement with the carrier to provide healthcare benefits."

OPM declines to make this change. We require these entities to be considered for SSSG comparison because we do not want businesses to form distinct entities under a corporate umbrella for the sole purposes of getting a lower rate for non-FEHBP groups. Our goal is to identify one non-FEHBP subscriber group (employer groups covered by an issuer) that is closest in size to the FEHBP group and, if the group received a discounted rate, the carrier must provide the discount to the FEHBP. We feel that, if carriers have the ability to shift groups under a corporate umbrella, the most appropriate SSSG will not be available for comparison to the FEHBP group and the FEHB program will be at greater risk. OPM also is not amending 48 CFR 1602.170-13(b)(1)(iv). Our intention is not to include SSSGs of entities with whom a Carrier contracts to provide health insurance coverage for its own employees. Additionally, we do not intend to set up a reinsurance arrangement. Our intent is to include entities where a Carrier has contracted provision of benefits to its customers to a third-party entity.

#### Regulatory Flexibility Act

OPM certifies that this regulation will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities because the regulation only affects health insurance carriers in the FEHB Program.

#### Executive Order 12866, Regulatory Review

This rule has been reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget in accordance with Executive Order 12866.

OPM has examined the impact of this final rule as required by Executive Order 12866 and Executive Order 13563, which direct agencies to assess all costs and benefits of available regulatory alternatives and, if regulation is necessary, to select regulatory approaches that maximize net benefits (including potential economic, environmental, public, health, and safety effects, distributive impacts, and equity). A regulatory impact analysis must be prepared for major rules with economically significant effects of \$100 million or more in any one year. This rule is not considered a major rule because there will be no increased costs to Federal agencies, Federal Employees, or Federal retirees in their health insurance premiums.

#### Federalism

We have examined this rule in accordance with Executive Order 13132, Federalism, and have determined that this rule will not have any negative impact on the rights, roles, and responsibilities of State, local, or tribal governments.

#### List of Subjects in 48 CFR Parts 1602, 1615, and 1652

Government employees, Government procurement, Health insurance reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

U.S. Office of Personnel Management.

**Katherine Archuleta,**

*Director.*

For the reasons set forth in the preamble, OPM amends chapter 16 of title 48 CFR (FEHBAR) as follows:

#### PART 1602—DEFINITIONS OF WORDS AND TERMS

- 1. The authority citation for part 1602 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 5 U.S.C. 8913; 40 U.S.C. 486(c); 48 CFR 1.301.

- 2. Revise § 1602.170-13 to read as follows:

#### § 1602.170-13 Similarly sized subscriber groups.

(a) A *Similarly sized subscriber group* (SSSG) is a non-FEHBP employer group that:

(1) As of the date specified by OPM in the rate instructions, has a subscriber enrollment closest to the FEHBP subscriber enrollment;

(2) Uses traditional community rating; and,

(3) Meets the criteria specified in the rate instructions issued by OPM.

(b) Any group with which an entity enters into an agreement to provide