Paperwork Reduction Act and is not derived from a comprehensive or even a representative survey or study of the costs of SEC rules and forms.

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 will have a practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information collected; 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.

Please direct your written comments to Kenneth A. Fogash, Acting Associate Executive Director/CIO, Office of Information Technology, Securities and Exchange Commission, 450 Fifth Street NW., Washington, DC 20549.

Dated: January 7, 2004.

#### J. Lynn Taylor,

Assistant Secretary.

[FR Doc. 04–801 Filed 1–13–04; 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 Filings and Information Services, Washington, DC 20549.

Extension: Rule 154 [17 CFR 230.154]; SEC File No. 270–438; OMB Control No. 3235–0495.

Notice is hereby given that, pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501–3520), the Securities and Exchange Commission (the "Commission") is soliciting comments on the collections of information summarized below. The Commission plans to submit these existing collections of information to the Office of Management and Budget for extension and approval.

The federal securities laws generally prohibit an issuer, underwriter, or dealer from delivering a security for sale unless a prospectus meeting certain requirements accompanies or precedes the security. Rule 154 [17 CFR 230.154] under the Securities Act of 1933 [15 U.S.C. 77a] (the "Securities Act")

permits, under certain circumstances, delivery of a single prospectus to investors who purchase securities from the same issuer and share the same address (''householding'') to satisfy the applicable prospectus delivery requirements.¹ The purpose of rule 154 is to reduce the amount of duplicative prospectuses delivered to investors sharing the same address.

Under rule 154, a prospectus is considered delivered to all investors at a shared address, for purposes of the federal securities laws, if the person relying on the rule delivers the prospectus to the shared address and the investors consent to the delivery of a single prospectus. The rule applies to prospectuses and prospectus supplements. Currently, the rule permits householding of all prospectuses by an issuer, underwriter, or dealer relying on the rule if, in addition to the other conditions set forth in the rule, the issuer, underwriter, or dealer has obtained from each investor written or implied consent to householding.<sup>2</sup> The rule requires issuers, underwriters, or dealers that wish to household prospectuses with implied consent to send a notice to each investor stating that the investors in the household will receive one prospectus in the future unless the investors provide contrary instructions. In addition, at least once a year, issuers, underwriters, or dealers, relying on rule 154 for the householding of prospectuses, must explain to investors who have provided written or implied consent how they can revoke their consent. Preparing and sending the initial notice and the annual explanation of the right to revoke are collections of information.

The rule allows issuers, underwriters, or dealers to household prospectuses and prospectus supplements if certain conditions are met. Among the conditions with which a person relying on the rule must comply are providing notice to each investor that only one prospectus will be sent to the household

and, in the case of issuers that are openend mutual funds, providing to each investor who consents to householding an annual explanation of the right to revoke consent to the delivery of a single prospectus to multiple investors sharing an address. The purpose of the notice and annual explanation requirements of the rule is to ensure that investors who wish to receive individual copies of shareholder reports are able to do so.

Although rule 154 is not limited to investment companies, the Commission believes that it is used mainly by openend mutual funds and by broker-dealers that deliver prospectuses for open-end mutual funds. The Commission is unable to estimate the number of issuers other than mutual funds that rely on the rule.

The Commission estimates that there are approximately 3,114 open-end mutual funds, approximately 200 of which engage in direct marketing and therefore deliver their own prospectuses. The Commission estimates that each direct-marketed mutual fund will spend an average of 20 hours per year complying with the notice requirement of the rule, for a total of 4,000 hours. The Commission estimates that each direct-marketed fund will also spend 1 hour complying with the explanation of the right to revoke requirement of the rule, for a total of 200 hours. The Commission estimates that there are approximately 300 broker-dealers that carry customer accounts and, therefore, may be required to deliver mutual fund prospectuses. The Commission estimates that each affected brokerdealer will spend, on average, approximately 20 hours complying with the notice requirement of the rule, for a total of 6,000 hours. Each broker-dealer will also spend 1 hour complying with the annual explanation of the right to revoke requirement, for a total of 300 hours. Therefore, the total number of respondents for rule 154 is 500 (200 mutual funds plus 300 broker-dealers), and the estimated total hour burden is 10,500 hours (4,200 hours for mutual funds plus 6,300 hours for brokerdealers).

The estimate of average burden hours is made solely for the purposes of the Paperwork Reduction Act, and is not derived from a comprehensive or even a representative survey or study of the costs of Commission rules and forms.

Written comments are invited on: (a) Whether the collections of information are necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Commission, including whether the information has practical utility; (b) the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>The Securities Act requires the delivery of prospectuses to investors who buy securities from an issuer or from underwriters or dealers who participate in a registered distribution of securities. See Securities Act sections 2(a)(10), 4(1), 4(3), 5(b) [15 U.S.C. 77b(a)(10), 77d(1), 77d(3), 77e(b); see also rule 174 under the Securities Act [17 CFR 230.174] (regarding the prospectus delivery obligation of dealers); rule 15c2–8 under the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934 [17 CFR 240.15c2–8] (prospectus delivery obligations of brokers and dealers).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Rule 154 permits the householding of prospectuses that are delivered electronically to investors only if delivery is made to a shared electronic address and the investors give written consent to householding. Implied consent is not permitted in such a situation. See rule 154(b)(4).

accuracy of the Commission's estimate of the burden of the collections of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collections of information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology. The Commission will consider comments and suggestions submitted in writing within 60 days after this publication.

Please direct your written comments to Kenneth A. Fogash, Acting Associate Executive Director/CIO, Office of Information Technology, Securities and Exchange Commission, 450 5th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20549.

Dated: January 6, 2004.

#### J. Lynn Taylor,

Assistant Secretary.

[FR Doc. 04-802 Filed 1-13-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010-01-P

## SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34–49029; File No. SR–NASD–2003–145]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; Order Granting Accelerated Approval to a Proposed Rule Change and Amendment Nos. 1 and 2 Thereto by the National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc. To Give Authority to a 3-Member Subcommittee of NASD's Market Regulation Committee To Review Alternative Display Facility System Outage and Denial of Excused Withdrawal Determinations

January 6, 2004.

On September 25, 2003, the National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc. ("NASD") submitted the proposed rule change to the Securities and Exchange Commission ("Commission"), pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 ("Act"), 1 and Rule 19b—4 thereunder. 2 On November 24, 2003 and December 2, 2003, NASD filed Amendment Nos. 13 and 24 to the

proposed rule change, respectively. The proposed rule change amends NASD Rules 4300A and 4619A(g) to give jurisdiction to a 3-member subcommittee of NASD's Market Regulation Committee ("MRC") to review system outage determinations under Rule 4300A(f) and excused withdrawal denials under Rule 4619A. The **Federal Register** published the proposed rule change, as amended, for comment on December 15, 2003. The Commission received no comments on the proposal.

The Commission finds that the proposed rule change, as amended, is consistent with the requirements of the Act and the rules and regulations thereunder applicable to a national securities exchange 6 and, in particular, the requirements of Section 6 of the Act 7 and the rules and regulations thereunder. The Commission finds that the proposed rule change is consistent with Section 6(b)(5) of the Act 8 and believes that the proposed rules should enable the NASD to take advantage of the MRC committee's expertise, and at the same time continue to provide market participants a sufficient process by which to appeal system outage and excused withdraw determinations.

The Commission finds good cause for accelerating approval of the proposed rule change and Amendment Nos. 1 and 2 prior to the thirtieth day after publication in the Federal Register. The Commission believes that accelerated approval will permit, without undue delay, the 3-member subcommittee of NASD's MRC to review system outage determinations and excused withdrawal denials. Accordingly, the Commission finds good cause, consistent with Section 19(b)(2) of the Act,9 to approve the proposed rule change, as amended, prior to the thirtieth day after publication of the notice of filing.

It is therefore ordered, pursuant to Section 19(b)(2) of the Act,<sup>10</sup> that the proposed rule change (SR–NASD–2003–145), as amended, is hereby approved, on an accelerated basis.

For the Commission, by the Division of Market Regulation, pursuant to delegated authority.<sup>11</sup>

#### J. Lynn Taylor,

 $Assistant\ Secretary.$ 

[FR Doc. 04–803 Filed 1–13–04; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 8010–01–P

## SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34-49046; File No. SR-SCCP-2002-07]

### Self-Regulatory Organizations; Stock Clearing Corporation of Philadelphia; Notice of Filing of a Proposed Rule Change Relating to Ex-Clearing Account Transactions

January 8, 2004.

Pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 ("Act"),¹ notice is hereby given that on December 26, 2002, the Stock Clearing Corporation of Philadelphia ("SCCP") 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 prepared primarily by SCCP. The Commission is publishing this notice to solicit comments on the proposed rule change from interested persons.

## I. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Terms of Substance of the Proposed Rule Change

The proposed rule change would amend SCCP Rule 11 (Ex-Clearing Accounts) to include a transaction in an ex-clearing account whereby both sides have agreed not to transmit the transaction from SCCP to the National Securities Clearing Corporation ("NSCC") for clearance and settlement.

## II. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Purpose of, and Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change

In its filing with the Commission, SCCP included statements concerning the purpose of and basis for the proposed rule change and discussed any comments it received on the proposed rule change. The text of these statements may be examined at the places specified in Item IV below. SCCP has prepared summaries, set forth in sections A, B, and C below, of the most significant aspects of such statements.<sup>2</sup>

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

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> 17 CFR 240.19b–4.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> NASD filed a new Form 19b–4, which replaces and supersedes the original filing in its entirety.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup>Letter from Philip A. Shaikun, Office of General Counsel, Regulatory Policy and Oversight, NASD, to Katherine A. England, Assistant Director, Division of Market Regulation, Commission, dated December 2, 2003 ("Amendment No. 2"). Amendment No. 2 deletes the following sentence from Exhibit 1 to the Form 19b–4: "NASD has designated the proposed rule change as concerned solely with administration of the self-regulatory organization under Section 19(b)(3)(A)(iii) of the Act and Rule 19b–4(f)(3) thereunder, which renders the proposal

effective upon receipt of this filing by the Commission."

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Securities Exchange Act Release No. 48880 (December 4, 2003), 68 FR 69734.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> In approving this proposed rule change, the Commission notes that it has considered the proposed rule's impact on efficiency, competition, and capital formation. 15 U.S.C. 78c(f).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> 15 U.S.C. 78f.

<sup>8 15</sup> U.S.C. 78f(b)(5).

<sup>9 15</sup> U.S.C. 78s(b)(2).

<sup>10</sup> Id.

<sup>11 17</sup> CFR 200.30-3(a)(12).

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

 $<sup>^{2}\,\</sup>mathrm{The}$  Commission has modified parts of these statements.