

2.302. The E-Filing process requires participants to submit and serve all adjudicatory documents over the internet, or in some cases, to mail copies on electronic storage media, unless an exemption permitting an alternative filing method, as further discussed, is granted. Detailed guidance on electronic submissions is located in the "Guidance for Electronic Submissions to the NRC" (ADAMS Accession No. ML13031A056), and on the NRC's public website (<https://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals.html>).

To comply with the procedural requirements of E-Filing, at least 10 days prior to the filing deadline, the participant should contact the Office of the Secretary by email at [Hearing.Docket@nrc.gov](mailto:Hearing.Docket@nrc.gov), or by telephone at 301-415-1677, to: (1) request a digital identification (ID) certificate which allows the participant (or their counsel or representative) to digitally sign submissions and access the E-Filing system for any proceeding in which it is participating; and (2) advise the Secretary that the participant will be submitting a petition or other adjudicatory document (even in instances in which the participant, or their counsel or representative, already holds an NRC-issued digital ID certificate). Based upon this information, the Secretary will establish an electronic docket for the proceeding if the Secretary has not already established an electronic docket.

Information about applying for a digital ID certificate is available on the NRC's public website (<https://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals/getting-started.html>). After a digital ID certificate is obtained and a docket is created, the participant must submit adjudicatory documents in the Portable Document Format. Guidance on submissions is available on the NRC's public website (<https://www.nrc.gov/site-help/electronic-sub-ref-mat.html>). A filing is considered complete at the time the document is submitted through the NRC's E-Filing system. To be timely, an electronic filing must be submitted to the E-Filing system no later than 11:59 p.m. ET on the due date. Upon receipt of a transmission, the E-Filing system time-stamps the document and sends the submitter an email confirming receipt of the document. The E-Filing system also distributes an email that provides access to the document to the NRC's Office of the General Counsel and any others who have advised the Office of the Secretary that they wish to participate in the proceeding, so that the filer need not serve the document on those participants separately. Therefore, applicants and other participants (or

their counsel or representative) must apply for and receive a digital ID certificate before adjudicatory documents are filed to obtain access to the documents via the E-Filing system.

A person filing electronically using the NRC's adjudicatory E-Filing system may seek assistance by contacting the NRC's Electronic Filing Help Desk through the "Contact Us" link located on the NRC's public website (<https://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals.html>), by email to [MSHD.Resource@nrc.gov](mailto:MSHD.Resource@nrc.gov), or by a toll-free call at 1-866-672-7640. The NRC Electronic Filing Help Desk is available between 9 a.m. and 6 p.m., ET, Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

Participants who believe that they have good cause for not submitting documents electronically must file an exemption request, in accordance with 10 CFR 2.302(g), with their initial paper filing stating why there is good cause for not filing electronically and requesting authorization to continue to submit documents in paper format. Such filings must be submitted in accordance with 10 CFR 2.302(b)-(d). Participants filing adjudicatory documents in this manner are responsible for serving their documents on all other participants. Participants granted an exemption under 10 CFR 2.302(g)(2) must still meet the electronic formatting requirement in 10 CFR 2.302(g)(1), unless the participant also seeks and is granted an exemption from 10 CFR 2.302(g)(1).

Documents submitted in adjudicatory proceedings will appear in the NRC's electronic hearing docket, which is publicly available on the NRC's public website (<https://adams.nrc.gov/ehd>), unless otherwise excluded pursuant to an order of the presiding officer. If you do not have an NRC-issued digital ID certificate as previously described, click "cancel" when the link requests certificates and you will be automatically directed to the NRC's electronic hearing docket where you will be able to access any publicly available documents in a particular hearing docket. Participants are requested not to include personal privacy information such as social security numbers, home addresses, or personal phone numbers in their filings unless an NRC regulation or other law requires submission of such information. With respect to copyrighted works, except for limited excerpts that serve the purpose of the adjudicatory filings and would constitute a Fair Use application, participants should not include copyrighted materials in their submission.

Copies of the application to renew NuFuels' license for the CUP *In-Situ* Recovery Facility are available for public inspection at the NRC's PDR, and on the NRC's public website at <https://www.nrc.gov/materials/uranium-recovery/license-apps>, while the application is under review. The application may be accessed in ADAMS through the NRC Library on the internet at <https://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html> under ADAMS Package Accession No. ML25022A289. As previously stated in this document, persons who do not have access to ADAMS or who encounter problems in accessing the documents located in ADAMS may contact the NRC's PDR reference staff by telephone at 1-800-397-4209 or 301-415-4737, or by email to [PDR.Resources@nrc.gov](mailto:PDR.Resources@nrc.gov).

(Authority: 42 U.S.C. 2011 *et seq.*)

Dated: May 21, 2026.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Candace Spore,**

*Acting Chief, Uranium Recovery and Materials Decommissioning Branch, Division of Decommissioning, Uranium Recovery and Waste Programs, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.*

[FR Doc. 2026-10440 Filed 5-26-26; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7590-01-P**

**OFFICE OF PERSONNEL  
MANAGEMENT**

[Docket ID: OPM-2026-0100]

**Confidential Government Information  
Nondisclosure Agreement**

**AGENCY:** Office of Personnel Management.

**ACTION:** Notice with request for comment.

**SUMMARY:** The Office of Personnel Management (OPM) requests comment on a draft nondisclosure agreement (NDA) for use by Federal agencies for both new and existing employees. The form is intended to document Federal employees' acknowledgment of, and agreement to comply with, current legal obligations to safeguard non-public, confidential, or proprietary information, created or obtained through their official duties, while expressly preserving the right to make disclosures authorized by law. OPM believes that a governmentwide NDA form will promote consistency across Government, better protect confidential information, and better inform Federal employees of their rights and obligations regarding confidential information.

**DATES:** Comments must be received on or before June 26, 2026.

**ADDRESSES:** You may submit comments using the Federal eRulemaking Portal at <https://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the instructions for sending comments.

The general policy for comments and other submissions from members of the public is to make these submissions available for public viewing at <https://www.regulations.gov> without change, and including any personal identifiers or contact information. Before finalizing the NDA, OPM will consider all comments received on or before the closing date for comments. OPM may make changes to the NDA after considering the comments received.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Joe Knouff, Suitability Director, (202) 599-0090. Email: [SuitEA@opm.gov](mailto:SuitEA@opm.gov), with Attn: NDA Information in the subject line.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Background and Authority

Congress has long authorized the President to ensure that individuals employed in the Federal civil service are suitable for Federal employment. Since 1871, Congress has empowered the President to prescribe regulations governing admission into the civil service, to ascertain the fitness and character of applicants, and to establish standards for the conduct of Federal employees in order to promote the efficiency of the service. Today, these authorities are reflected in 5 U.S.C. 3301 and 7301, which authorize the President to prescribe regulations for admission to the civil service, to assess applicant fitness and character, and to regulate employee conduct in the executive branch.

Historically, the President has delegated this authority to the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) and its predecessor, the Civil Service Commission, including responsibility for establishing suitability standards and for conducting suitability investigations related to appointment and continued Federal employment. OPM exercises this authority through regulations governing suitability and fitness determinations, which are intended to identify character or conduct that may adversely affect the integrity or efficiency of the service.

In addition to suitability standards, Federal employees are subject to longstanding legal requirements to safeguard nonpublic information obtained through their official duties. These obligations arise under multiple authorities, including the Standards of Ethical Conduct for Employees of the

Executive Branch (5 CFR part 2635), which prohibit the unauthorized disclosure of nonpublic information, implementing regulations of the Federal Records Act at 36 CFR 1222.24(a)(6), as well as statutes such as the Privacy Act of 1974.<sup>1</sup> Together, these requirements reflect the expectation that Federal employees will handle Federal records and other non-public, confidential, or proprietary information responsibly and refrain from disclosing such information without authorization or through unauthorized channels. OPM is defining “Confidential Government Information” for purposes of the NDA as all non-public, confidential, or proprietary information, to include, but not be limited to, information relating to internal agency operations, personnel matters, procurement processes, or any sensitive, pre-decisional or deliberative material that is not currently publicly available and should not be disclosed under applicable law.

Federal employees do not have discretion to disclose Confidential Government Information outside of narrow circumstances prescribed by relevant authorities and implemented by procedures which may differ by agency.<sup>2</sup> Unauthorized disclosures of Confidential Government Information disrupt agency operations and erode public trust. In recent months, unauthorized disclosures have included internal government materials not intended for public release, such as pre-decisional documents and interagency comments exchanged during internal coordination processes.<sup>3</sup> There have been several recent instances in which internal agency communications related to rulemaking and policy development were disclosed without authorization.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> These obligations include prohibitions against using nonpublic information to further one’s own private interests, as well as governing the collection, maintenance, use, and dissemination of information about individuals maintained in systems of record by federal agencies. See 5 CFR 2635 and the Privacy Act of 1974 (5 U.S.C. 552a).

<sup>2</sup> Such circumstances would include disclosures to Congress, an Inspector General, or other designated individuals that are protected under the Whistleblower Protection Act, 5 U.S.C. 2302(b) (*i.e.*, a violation of any law, rule, or regulation; mismanagement, a gross waste of funds, or an abuse of authority; or a substantial and specific danger to public health or safety).

<sup>3</sup> Wagner, Erich and Eric Katz, “Agencies internally pan OPM’s bid to overhaul federal performance management,” Government Executive (Jan. 29, 2026), <https://www.govexec.com/workforce/2026/01/agencies-internally-pan-opms-bid-overhaul-federal-performance-management/411051/>.

<sup>4</sup> Friedman, Drew, “OPM seeks broader authority to fire federal employees, draft regulations show,” Federal News Network (Mar. 26, 2025), <https://federalnewsnetwork.com/workforce/2025/03/opm-seeks-broader-authority-to-fire-federal-employees-draft-regulations-show/>.

Such disclosures risk chilling candid interagency feedback, disrupting orderly decision-making, and weakening trust within and among Federal agencies.

These are not the only types of recent incidents underscoring the need for an NDA. In 2025, several Federal employees in the Federal Bureau of Investigation and Department of Homeland Security (DHS) engaged in unauthorized disclosure on planned immigration enforcement actions—disclosures that impeded enforcement of Federal law and put the lives of Federal agents in danger.<sup>5</sup> In early 2026, the New York Times and Washington Post received unauthorized disclosures from Federal employees divulging the secret U.S. raid on Venezuela prior to it occurring.<sup>6</sup> These leaks put the lives of members of the armed forces at risk, leading news organizations to delay “publishing what they knew to avoid endangering US troops.”<sup>7</sup> Also this year, the personal information of approximately 4,500 ICE employees—including nearly 2,000 employees working in frontline enforcement—was disclosed by a Federal employee, including names, addresses, email addresses, phone numbers, and job titles.<sup>8</sup> This leak jeopardized the safety of the agents.<sup>9</sup>

The problem is so widespread that the Supreme Court itself has instituted the use of nondisclosure agreements to attempt to dissuade staff from the harmful practice of disclosing Confidential Government Information and as a means to hold individuals

<sup>5</sup> Pritchett, Elizabeth, “DHS says it ‘can, should and will’ administer polygraph exams amid ICE raid location leaks,” Fox News (Feb. 19, 2025), <https://www.foxnews.com/us/dhs-says-can-should-will-administer-polygraph-exams-amid-ice-raid-location-leaks>; Ainsley, Julia, and Jonathan Allen, “DHS has begun performing polygraph tests on employees to find leakers,” NBC News (Mar. 8, 2025), <https://www.nbcnews.com/politics/national-security/dhs-begun-performing-polygraph-tests-employees-find-leakers-rcna195485>.

<sup>6</sup> Tani, Max, and Shelby Talcott, “News organizations held off on reporting Venezuela raid,” Semafor (Jan. 3, 2026), <https://www.semafor.com/article/01/03/2026/new-york-times-washington-post-held-off-on-reporting-venezuela-raid>.

<sup>7</sup> *Id.*

<sup>8</sup> Putnam, Joanna, “‘ICE List’ doxxing site alleges DHS whistleblower leaked identities of 4,500 agents” Police1 (Jan. 14, 2026), <https://www.police1.com/officer-safety/ice-list-doxxing-site-alleges-dhs-whistleblower-leaked-identities-of-4-500-agents>.

<sup>9</sup> U.S. Department of Homeland Security, ICE Officers Face an 8,000% Increase in Death Threats Against Them and Their Families (press release) (Jan. 26, 2026), <https://www.dhs.gov/news/2026/01/26/ice-officers-face-8000-increase-death-threats-against-them-and-their-families>; Carnahan, Ashley, “Self-identified Antifa member arrested after allegedly threatening ICE agents, DOJ says” Fox News (Feb. 5, 2026), <https://www.foxnews.com/us/self-identified-antifa-member-arrested-after-allegedly-threatening-ice-agents-doj-says>.

accountable for such behavior.<sup>10</sup> The Supreme Court took this step after a shocking incident where an individual, likely a law clerk, disclosed (without authorization) a copy of a draft decision in a controversial abortion case to a reporter.<sup>11</sup> In the weeks and months that followed, Supreme Court justices were subject to threats and harassment as a result of the leak,<sup>12</sup> and one was subject to an assassination plot. A would-be assassin traveled to the house of Justice Brett Kavanaugh, armed with a gun and burglary tools, with the intention of breaking into the Justice's house and killing him.<sup>13</sup> The would-be assassin was specifically motivated by the release of the leaked draft decision.<sup>14</sup>

On February 11, 2025, the President issued Executive Order 14210, *Implementing the President's "Department of Government Efficiency" Workforce Optimization Initiative*. Among other actions, the Executive Order directed OPM to revise its suitability regulations to address integrity-related conduct, including refusal to certify compliance with nondisclosure obligations. Consistent with that directive, OPM published a proposed rule titled *Suitability and Fitness* on June 3, 2025 (90 FR 23467). The proposed rule would amend 5 CFR part 731 to emphasize the impact of noncompliance with nondisclosure

obligations in suitability and fitness determinations.

In parallel with this regulatory effort, OPM has developed a proposed NDA for use by Federal agencies that elect to document employees' acknowledgment of, and agreement to comply with, existing non-disclosure obligations. The proposed NDA does not create new substantive restrictions on employee speech or disclosure rights. Rather, it is designed to provide agencies with a standardized mechanism for employees to acknowledge and agree to comply with obligations that already exist under law and regulation, while expressly preserving rights to make disclosures authorized by law, including protected whistleblower disclosures. The NDA also does not replace or nullify any other nondisclosure agreements an individual may be required to sign in connection with his or her position.

OPM believes that a standard NDA form will promote consistency across Government, better protect confidential information, and better inform Federal employees of their rights and obligations regarding confidential information. OPM expects that the proposed NDA will be an Optional Form, meaning that Federal agencies would have discretion whether to use the NDA.

Should agencies elect to use the NDA, it would be administered to newly hired employees as part of the onboarding process and to current Federal employees. In addition, for new hires, a requirement to sign the NDA would be advertised as part of a job opening announcement for the vacancy. OPM expects that a new agreement would be executed if there is an agency change or the employee has a break in service; however, OPM would not expect an employee to sign a new agreement for every position change within an agency. The form would serve as a certification that the employee understands and agrees to comply with applicable nondisclosure requirements associated with Federal service.

This form would also become part of an employee's Electronic Official Personnel Folder (eOPF) which contains records and documents related to Federal civilian employment and follows an employee throughout service with any federal agency. It is maintained in the eOPF as required by updates to OPM's Operating Manual, "The Guide to Personnel Recordkeeping."<sup>15</sup> OPM's Govt-1

system of records notice currently lists, among other things, the "contents of the OPF as specified in OPM's Operating Manual, "The Guide to Personnel Recordkeeping" (GPR) as a category of record that is covered in the system. Thus Govt-1 is intended to cover everything in the OPF that is required by the GPR, and OPM does not plan to modify it to accommodate the NDA.

OPM is publishing the proposed form to provide public notice and allow for public comment to promote transparency, encourage consistency across agencies, and provide interested parties an opportunity to comment on the form's content, clarity, and potential implementation considerations.

The NDA is not subject to the Paperwork Reduction Act, as amended (44 U.S.C. chapter 35). See 5 CFR 1320.3(c)(4), which excludes from the definition of a regulated "collection of information" a collection from current employees of the Federal government when acting within the scope of their employment.

#### Request for Comment

OPM welcomes public comments on all aspects of the draft NDA, including whether the Privacy Act statement's description of the authority, principal purposes, routine uses, and effects provide sufficient notice to employees. The draft NDA is available in the docket for this notice on regulations.gov. See <https://www.regulations.gov/document/OPM-2026-0100-0003>. OPM specifically requests comment on the following issues.

1. What scope of information should be covered by the NDA? Should it cover only unclassified information? How do you understand the terms *confidential* and *confidentiality* in the context of this NDA? What customization of the NDA, if any, may be necessary for agencies to ensure it covers the appropriate information?

2. Does the NDA clearly communicate the types of information that would be subject to non-disclosure requirements? If not, how could OPM better describe what information can or cannot be disclosed to ensure employees have appropriate notice of their responsibilities?

3. Are there other statutes to which OPM should cite in Appendix A of the NDA when describing the nondisclosure requirements applicable to individuals working for or on behalf of the Federal government?

4. Do you have suggestions regarding the layout or formatting of the NDA?

5. Does the Privacy Act statement in the NDA provide sufficient notice to employees of the authorities, principal

<sup>10</sup> Kantor, Jodi, "How the Supreme Court Secretly Made Itself Even More Secretive," *The New York Times*, (Feb. 2, 2026), <https://www.nytimes.com/2026/02/02/us/supreme-court-nondisclosure-agreements.html>.

<sup>11</sup> Gerstein, Josh and Alexander Ward, "Supreme Court has Voted to Overturn Abortion Rights, Draft Opinion Shows," *Politico* (May 3, 2022), <https://www.politico.com/news/2022/05/02/supreme-court-abortion-draft-opinion-00029473>. OPM notes that while the identity of the individual who leaked the information is unknown, the only individuals who had access to the draft were justices and their clerks, and it is most unlikely that a justice leaked the document.

<sup>12</sup> Letter from State Attorneys General to Merrick Garland, *Recent Efforts To Intimidate Supreme Court Justices* (May 11, 2022), available at [https://content.govdelivery.com/attachments/OKAG/2022/05/12/file\\_attachments/2157362/Letter%20re%20SCT%20Protests.pdf](https://content.govdelivery.com/attachments/OKAG/2022/05/12/file_attachments/2157362/Letter%20re%20SCT%20Protests.pdf); Carolyn Vakil, GOP governors, state AGs urge Garland to enforce federal law to protect Supreme Court justices (May 12, 2022), available at <https://thehill.com/regulation/court-battles/3486441-gop-governors-state-ags-urge-garland-to-enforce-federal-law-to-protect-supreme-court-justices/>

<sup>13</sup> McFarlane, Scott and Melissa Quinn, "Man who tried to assassinate Kavanaugh in 2022 wanted to kill 3 justices, prosecutors say," *CBS News* (Sept. 19, 2025), <https://www.cbsnews.com/news/nicholas-roske-brett-kavanaugh-sentencing/>.

<sup>14</sup> U.S. Department of Justice, Nicholas Roske Sentenced to Over Eight Years in Prison for Attempted Murder of Supreme Court Justice in Maryland (press release) (Oct. 3, 2025), <https://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/nicholas-roske-sentenced-over-eight-years-prison-attempted-murder-supreme-court-justice>.

<sup>15</sup> OPM's "Guide to Personnel Recordkeeping" is available at <https://www.opm.gov/policy-data-oversight/data-analysis-documentation/personnel-documentation/#url=Personnel-Recordkeeping>.

purposes, routine uses, and effects of the form?

6. Does the OPM/GOVT-1 system of records notice provide sufficient notice that the government-wide system of records would maintain records related to the signing of, or failure to sign, the NDA?

7. What are the appropriate actions, if any, for agencies to consider taking if existing employees choose not to sign the NDA?

8. What are the appropriate actions, if any, for agencies to consider taking if new employees choose not to sign the NDA?

9. Does the NDA clearly communicate the potential consequences of refusal to sign the form for both existing and new employees, along with whether signing the form is voluntary or mandatory?

10. What else should OPM consider with regard to the NDA??

OPM will consider comments received before finalizing the NDA.

OPM plans to submit the form to the General Services Administration (GSA) for designation as a GSA Form.

**Signing Statement**

The Director of OPM, Scott Kupor, reviewed and approved this document and has authorized the undersigned to electronically sign and submit this document to the Office of the Federal Register for publication.

Office of Personnel Management.

**Jerson Matias,**  
*Federal Register Liaison.*

[FR Doc. 2026-10471 Filed 5-26-26; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6325-38-P**

**POSTAL SERVICE**

**Product Change—Priority Mail and USPS Ground Advantage Negotiated Service Agreements**

**AGENCY:** Postal Service.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Postal Service gives notice of filing a request with the Postal Regulatory Commission to add a domestic shipping services contract to the list of Negotiated Service Agreements in the Mail Classification Schedule’s Competitive Products List.

**DATES:** *Date of required notice:* May 27, 2026.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Sean C. Robinson, 202-268-8405.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The United States Postal Service hereby gives notice that, pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 3642 and 3632(b)(3), it filed with the Postal Regulatory Commission the following requests:

Date filed with Postal Regulatory Commission	Negotiated service agreement product category and No.	MC Docket No.	K Docket No.
05/18/26 .....	PM-GA 992 .....	MC2026-248	K2026-246
05/19/26 .....	PM-GA 993 .....	MC2026-249	K2026-247
05/19/26 .....	PM-GA 994 .....	MC2026-250	K2026-248
05/19/26 .....	PM-GA 995 .....	MC2026-251	K2026-249
05/20/26 .....	PM-GA 996 .....	MC2026-252	K2026-250

Documents are available at [www.prc.gov](http://www.prc.gov).

**Sean C. Robinson,**  
*Attorney, Corporate and Postal Business Law.*  
[FR Doc. 2026-10531 Filed 5-26-26; 8:45 am]  
**BILLING CODE 7710-12-P**

**SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION**

[Release No. 34-105533; File No. SR-ICC-2026-003]

**Self-Regulatory Organizations; ICE Clear Credit LLC; Notice of Filing of Proposed Rule Change Relating to the Clearance of Additional Credit Default Swap Contracts**

May 21, 2026.

Pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934,<sup>1</sup> and Rule 19b-4,<sup>2</sup> notice is hereby given that on May 12, 2026, ICE Clear Credit LLC (“ICC” or “ICE Clear Credit”) filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (“Commission”) the proposed rule change as described in Items I, II and III below, which Items have been primarily prepared by ICC.

The Commission is publishing this notice to solicit comments on the proposed rule change from interested persons.

**I. Clearing Agency’s Statement of the Terms of Substance of the Proposed Rule Change**

The principal purpose of the proposed rule change is to revise the ICC Credit Default Swap (“CDS”) Rulebook (the “Rules”)<sup>3</sup> to provide for the clearance of additional Standard Emerging Market Sovereign Single Name CDS contracts and for the clearance of an additional Asia/Pacific Sovereign Single Name CDS contract (collectively, the “Sovereign Contracts”).

**II. Clearing Agency’s Statement of the Purpose of, and Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change**

In its filing with the Commission, ICC included statements concerning the purpose of and basis for the proposed rule change, security-based swap submission, or advance notice and discussed any comments it received on the proposed rule change, security-based swap submission, or advance

notice. The text of these statements may be examined at the places specified in Item IV below. ICC has prepared summaries, set forth in sections (A), (B), and (C) below, of the most significant aspects of these statements.

*(A) Clearing Agency’s Statement of the Purpose of, and Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change*

(a) Purpose

The purpose of the proposed rule change is to adopt rules that will provide the basis for ICC to clear additional CDS contracts. ICC believes the addition of these Sovereign Contracts will benefit the market for CDS by providing market participants the benefits of clearing, including reduction in counterparty risk, and safeguarding of margin assets pursuant to clearing house rules. Clearing of the additional Sovereign Contracts will not require any changes to ICC’s Risk Management Framework or other policies and procedures. ICC believes the proposed revisions will facilitate the prompt and accurate clearance and settlement of securities transactions and derivative agreements, contracts, and transactions for which it is responsible. ICC proposes to expand its product offering to include the additional

<sup>1</sup> 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

<sup>2</sup> 17 CFR 240.19b-4.

<sup>3</sup> Capitalized terms used but not defined herein have the meanings specified in the Rules.