

Overall, I am unpersuaded that this transaction diminishes competition in any relevant market.<sup>7</sup> Even had I concluded otherwise, however, I would not endorse the proposed consent, the terms of which would require (1) SGI to port its software to a workstation competitor and (2) SGI to maintain an open architecture and to provide access to software developers on nondiscriminatory terms. The problems with remedies of this sort are significant.<sup>8</sup> First, requiring a firm to sell an input to a rival is an ineffective remedy unless the Commission also regulates terms of the sale. Otherwise, the seller simply raises price and/or diminishes quality to the point where profitable entry is precluded. The Commission could seek an order that confers such regulatory power (the current order does not); however, the burden associated with enforcing such an order—the Commission would be required to determine the “competitive price” and “competitive quality” for such porting rights—cannot be overestimated. For this reason, the Commission historically has shied away from such remedies.

Second, requiring SGI to port entertainment graphics software to third parties will likely create substantial inefficiencies. The evidence clearly suggests that there are efficiencies associated with exclusive arrangements between software and hardware vendors; such arrangements existed well before the current transaction was proposed. Preventing SGI from availing

itself of those efficiencies will not benefit consumers.

[FR Doc. 95-16453 Filed 7-3-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6750-01-M

**Senior Executive Service: Performance Review Board**

**AGENCY:** Federal Trade Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** Notice is hereby given of the names of the standing Performance Review Board Roster.

**DATES:** July 5, 1995.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Elliott H. Davis, Director of Personnel, Federal Trade Commission (FTC), 6th & Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20580, (202) 326-2022.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Section 4314(c) (1) through (5) of title 5, U.S.C., requires each agency to establish, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Office of Personnel Management, one or more performance review boards. The board shall, among other things, review and evaluate the initial appraisal of a senior executive’s performance by the supervisor, and make appropriate recommendations to the appointing authority.

The following persons are appointed to the FTC’s Performance Review Board Roster: Office of the Chairman: James Hamill; Office of the Inspector General: Frederick Zirkel; Office of the Executive Director: Robert Walton, Rosemarie Straight, Alan Proctor, James Giffin, Richard Arnold; General Counsel:

Stephen Calkins, Jay Shaffer, Ernest Isenstadt, Christian White; Office of the Secretary: Donald Clark; Bureau of Competition: William Baer, Mary Lou Steptoe, Mark Whitener, Ronald Rowe, Michael McNeely, Walter Winslow, Mark Horoschak; Bureau of Consumer Protection: Joan Bernstein, Teresa Schwartz, Lydia Parnes, David Medine, Eileen Harrington, Dean Graybill, C. Lee Peeler; Bureau of Economics: Jonathan Baker, Ronald Bond, Gary Roberts, Paul Pautler.

**Donald S. Clark,**

*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 95-16448 Filed 7-3-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6750-01-M

**DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES**

**Administration for Children and Families**

**Agency Information Collection Under OMB Review**

*Title:* Small Business Innovation Research Program “Phase I Proposal Cover Sheet”.

*OMB No.:* 0980-0193.

*Description:* These forms are needed for inclusion in the Administration for Children and Families’ biennial Research Program’s research and development solicitation. They are required by Policy Directive from the Small Business Administration.

*Respondents:* State governments.

Title	Number of respondents	Number of responses per respondent	Average burden per response	Burden
Policy Directive SBIR ..... Estimated Total Annual Burden: 2000.	500	1	4	2000

**Additional Information:** Copies of the proposed collection may be obtained from Bob Sargis of the Division of Information Resource Management, ACF, by calling (202) 690-7275.

**OMB Comment:** Consideration will be given to comments and suggestions received within 30 days of publication. Written comments and recommendations for the proposed

information collection should be sent directly to the following: Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project, 725 17th Street NW., Washington, DC 20503, Attn: Ms. Wendy Taylor.

Dated: June 26, 1995.

**Robertta Katson,**

*Acting Director, Office of Information Resource Management.*

[FR Doc. 95-16437 Filed 7-3-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4184-01-M

a vertical merger—premerger market power in a relevant market—is satisfied.

<sup>7</sup>The complaint also alleges that vertical integration of SGI with Alias and Wavefront will foster anticompetitive price discrimination against certain entertainment graphics customers. If the customers already are differentiable according to their demand elasticities for SGI workstations (or

for the acquired software products), it is not clear how the vertical integration enhances the probability of price discrimination. To the extent that price discrimination possibilities are enhanced, it would appear to be as a result of the horizontal combination of Alias and Wavefront. And if SGI and the combined Alias/Wavefront would have market power in their respective complementary

markets, the most likely effect of vertical integration may be lower prices.

<sup>8</sup>For a discussion of why nondiscrimination remedies are problematic, see Timothy Brennan, Why Regulated Firms Should Be Kept Out of Unregulated Markets: Understanding the Divestiture in *U.S. v. AT&T*, 32 Antitrust Bulletin 741 (1987).

**Agency Information Collection Under OMB Review**

Title: Quarterly Performance Report.  
OMB No.: 0970-0036.

*Description:* The respondents are State Refugee Coordinators who will compile and enter data on refugee receipt of cash assistance and medical assistance as well as utilization of social services by category. ORR uses this

information to manage the program, evaluate the effectiveness of individual programs, and to project expenditures for upcoming quarters.

*Respondents:* State governments.

Title	Number of respondents	Number of responses per respondent	Average burden per response	Burden
ORR-6 .....	48	4	3.875	744

Estimated Total Annual Burden: 744.

*Additional Information:* Copies of the proposed collection may be obtained from Bob Sargis of the Division of Information Resource Management, ACF, by calling (202) 690-7275.

*OMB Comment:* Consideration will be given to comments and suggestions received within 30 days of publication. Written comments and recommendations for the proposed information collection should be sent directly to the following: Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project, 725 17th Street NW., Washington, DC 20503, Attn: Ms. Wendy Taylor.

Dated: June 27, 1995.

**Roberta Katson,**

*Acting Director, Office of Information Resource Management.*

[FR Doc. 95-16438 Filed 7-3-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4184-01-M

Cooked/Frozen Shrimp—Adulterated by Decomposition,” because it no longer reflects FDA policy. The CPG provides guidance on when entries of canned and cooked/frozen shrimp should be detained based on decomposition. The CPG focuses on the results of analysis for indole levels in the shrimp. The mere absence of indole does not mean, however, that the shrimp is acceptable. Organoleptic analysis can also be used to determine whether the shrimp is adulterated.

FDA’s experience using CPG 7119.13 as guidance has been that this CPG has been subject to misinterpretation by industry. To minimize the apparent confusion that exists as a result of this misinterpretation, FDA has decided to revoke the CPG. FDA intends to use any appropriate methods of analysis for examining canned and cooked/frozen shrimp offered for import.

Dated: June 28, 1995.

**Ronald G. Chesemore**

*Associate Commissioner for Regulatory Affairs.*

[FR Doc. 95-16318 Filed 7-3-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4160-01-F

**Food and Drug Administration**

[Docket No. 80D-0415]

**Miscellaneous Compliance Policy Guide (CPG); Revocation**

**AGENCY:** Food and Drug Administration, HHS.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) is announcing the revocation of CPG 7119.13, “Canned and Cooked/Frozen Shrimp—Adulterated by Decomposition,” because it no longer reflects agency policy. This action is being taken to ensure that FDA’s CPG’s accurately reflect FDA policy and to limit confusion.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** July 5, 1995.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Mary I. Snyder, Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition (HFS-416), Food and Drug Administration, 200 C St. SW., Washington, DC 20204, 202-418-3160.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** FDA is revoking CPG 7119.13 “Canned and

this proposal. Comments must be received within thirty (30) days from the date of this Notice. Comments should refer to the proposal by name and should be sent to: Joseph F. Lackey, Jr., OMB Desk Officer, Office of Management and Budget, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20503.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Kay F. Weaver, Reports Management Officer, Department of Housing and Urban Development, 451 7th Street, Southwest, Washington, DC 20410, telephone (202) 708-0050. This is not a toll-free number. Copies of the proposed forms and other available documents submitted to OMB may be obtained from Ms. Weaver.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Department has submitted the proposal for the collection of information, as described below, to OMB for review, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35).

The Notice lists the following information: (1) The title of the information collection proposal; (2) the office of the agency to collect the information; (3) the description of the need for the information and its proposed use; (4) the agency form number, if applicable; (5) what members of the public will be affected by the proposal; (6) an estimate of the total number of hours needed to prepare the information submission including number of respondents, frequency of response, and hours of response; (7) whether the proposal is new or an extension, reinstatement, or vision of an information collection requirement; and (8) the names and telephone numbers of an agency official familiar with the proposal and of the OMB Desk Officer for the Department.

**Authority:** Section 3507 of the Paperwork Reduction Act, 44 U.S.C. 3507; Section 7(d) of the Department of Housing and Urban Development Act, 42 U.S.C. 3535(d).

**DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT**

**Office of Administration**

[Docket No. FR-3917-N-05]

**Notice of Submission of Proposed Information Collection to OMB**

**AGENCY:** Office of Administration, HUD.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The proposed information collection requirement described below has been submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act. The Department is soliciting public comments on the subject proposal.

**ADDRESSES:** Interested persons are invited to submit comments regarding