

with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing additions or changes to its standards development activities. The notifications were filed for the purposes of extending the Act's provisions limiting the recovery of antitrust plaintiffs to actual damages under specified circumstances. Specifically, ASTM has provided an updated list of current, ongoing ASTM standards activities originating after April 1, 2005, designated as Work Items. A complete listing of ASTM Work Items, along with a brief description of each, is available at <http://www.astm.org>.

On September 15, 2004, ASTM filed its original notification pursuant to Section 6(a) of the Act. The Department of Justice published a notice in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on November 10, 2004 (69 FR 65226).

The last notification was filed with the Department on April 12, 2005. A notice was published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on May 12, 2005 (70 FR 25110).

For additional information, please contact: Thomas B. O'Brien, Jr., General Counsel, at ASTM International, 100 Barr Harbor Drive, West Conshohocken, PA 19428, telephone 610-832-9597, e-mail address tobrien@astm.org.

Dorothy Fountain,

Deputy Director of Operations, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 05-16960 Filed 8-25-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-11-M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—Joint Research and Development Program for the Advancement of In Situ Bioremediation Technologies

Notice is hereby given that, on August 1, 2005, pursuant section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* ("the Act"), Joint Research and Development Program for the Advancement of In Situ Bioremediation Technologies ("Bioremediation Consortium") has filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing changes in its membership. The notifications were filed for the purpose of extending the Act's provisions limiting the recovery of antitrust plaintiffs to actual damages under specified circumstances.

Specifically, Honeywell International Inc., Phoenix, AZ has been added as a party to this venture. Also, W.S. Atkins Consultants Ltd., Epsom, United Kingdom has withdrawn as a party to this venture.

No other changes have been made in either the membership or planned activity of the group research project. Membership in this group research project remains open, and Bioremediation Consortium intends to file additional written notification disclosing all changes in membership.

On March 11, 2005, Bioremediation Consortium filed its original notification pursuant to section 6(a) of the Act. The Department of Justice published a notice in the **Federal Register** pursuant to section 6(b) of the Act on April 19, 2005 (70 FR 20400).

Dorothy B. Fountain,

Deputy Director of Operations Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 05-16957 Filed 8-25-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-11-M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—IMS Global Learning Consortium, Inc.

Notice is hereby given that, on August 1, 2005, pursuant to section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* ("the Act"), IMS Global Learning Consortium, Inc. has filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing changes in its membership. The notifications were filed for the purpose of extending the Act's provisions limiting the recovery of antitrust plaintiffs to actual damages under specified circumstances. Specifically, Stanford University, Stanford, CA; University of Maryland University College, Adelphi, MD; and ANGEL Learning, Indianapolis, IN have been added as parties to this venture.

Also, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA; Oracle Corporation, Redwood Shores, CA; Saba Software, Inc., Redwood Shores, CA; IVIMEDS Limited, Dundee, Scotland, United Kingdom; SumTotal Systems, Inc., Bellevue, WA; and Thing, Baltimore, MD have withdrawn as parties to this venture.

No other changes have been made in either the membership or planned activity of the group research project. Membership in this group research

project remains open, and IMS Global Learning Consortium, Inc. intends to file additional written notification disclosing all changes in membership.

On April 7, 2005, IMS Global Learning Consortium, Inc. filed its original notification pursuant to section 6(a) of the Act. The Department of Justice published a notice in the **Federal Register** pursuant to section 6(b) of the Act on September 13, 2000 (65 FR 55283).

The last notification was filed with the Department on May 9, 2005. A notice was published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to section 6(b) of the Act on June 3, 2005 (70 FR 32653).

Dorothy B. Fountain,

Deputy Director of Operations, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 05-16958 Filed 8-25-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-11-M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—Network Centric Operations Industry Consortium, Inc.

Notice is hereby given that, on August 5, 2005, pursuant to Section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* ("the Act"), Network Centric Operations Industry Consortium, Inc. has filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing changes in its membership. The notifications were filed for the purpose of extending the Act's provisions limiting the recovery of antitrust plaintiffs to actual damages under specified circumstances. Specifically, SAP Labs, Inc., Washington, DC; INDRA Sistemas, S.A., Madrid, Spain; BearingPoint, Inc., McLean, VA; Systematic Software Engineering A/S, Aarhus, Denmark; The Aerospace Corporation, El Segundo, CA; Objective Interface Systems, Inc., Herndon, VA; Crystal Group, Inc., Hiawatha, IA; Anteon Corporation, Fairfax, VA; University of Maryland, Center for Satellite & Hybrid Communication Networks, College Park, MD; and Systems Integration & Development, Inc., Rockville, MD have been added as parties to this venture.

No other changes have been made in either the membership or planned activity of the group research project. Membership in this group research project remains open, and Network Centric Operations Industry

Consortium, Inc. intends to file additional written notification disclosing all changes in membership.

On November 19, 2004, Network Centric Operations Industry Consortium, Inc. filed its original notification pursuant to Section 6(a) of the Act. The Department of Justice published a notice in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on February 2, 2005 (70 FR 5486).

The last notification was filed with the Department on May 11, 2005. A notice was published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on June 13, 2005 (70 FR 34150).

Dorothy B. Fountain,

Deputy Director of Operations, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 05-16961 Filed 8-25-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-11-M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—Storage Bridge Bay Working Group, Inc.

Notice is hereby given that, on August 9, 2005, pursuant to Section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et. seq.* (“the Act”), Storage Bridge Bay Working Group, Inc. (“SBB”) has filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing (1) the name and principal place of business of the standards development organization and (2) the nature and scope of its standards development activities. The notifications were filed for the purpose of invoking the Act’s provisions limiting the recovery of antitrust plaintiffs to actual damages under specified circumstances.

Pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act, the name and principal place of business of the Standards development organization is: Storage Bridge Bay Working Group, Inc., Redwood City, CA. The nature and scope of SBB’s standards development activities are: Promoting the computer industry by supporting and facilitating the development of interoperable and compatible storage components with reference to controller slot compatibility between and among storage solutions. These purposes include the objective of developing and publishing a “storage bridge bay” specification that will serve as a reference and guideline for defining physical, mechanical, electrical and low-level enclosure management

requirements for an enclosure controller slot that will support a variety of storage controllers from a variety of independent hardware vendors and independent software vendors. Any storage controller design based on this specification shall be able to fit, connect, and operate within any storage enclosure controller slot design based on the same specification.

Dorothy B. Fountain,

Deputy Director of Operations Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 05-16959 Filed 8-25-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-11-M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. DEA-271N]

Clarification of Existing Requirements Under the Controlled Substances Act for Prescribing Schedule II Controlled Substances

AGENCY: Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), Justice.

ACTION: Clarification.

SUMMARY: On January 18, 2005, DEA published in the **Federal Register** a solicitation of comments on the subject of dispensing controlled substances for the treatment of pain. Many of the comments that the agency received indicate that there is a need to issue a clarification regarding certain aspects of the prescription requirements for schedule II controlled substances. This document provides such clarification.

DATES: August 26, 2005.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Patricia M. Good, Chief, Liaison and Policy Section, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration, Washington, DC 20537; Telephone: (202) 307-7297.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On January 18, 2005, the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) published in the **Federal Register** a Solicitation of Comments on the subject of dispensing controlled substances for the treatment of pain. 70 FR 2883. Most of the comments that the agency received sought clarification on the legal requirements governing the prescribing of schedule II controlled substances by physicians in view of DEA’s November 16, 2004, Interim Policy Statement. 69 FR 67170. Given these comments, DEA wishes to reiterate the following principles under the Controlled Substances Act (CSA) and DEA regulations.

1. As the Interim Policy Statement states, “For a physician to prepare multiple prescriptions [for a schedule II controlled substance] on the same day with instructions to fill on different dates is tantamount to writing a prescription authorizing refills of a schedule II controlled substance.” To do so conflicts with the provision of the CSA which provides: “No prescription for a controlled substance in schedule II may be refilled.”

2. Many of the comments that DEA received were from patients who said they have been receiving prescriptions for schedule II controlled substances for several years (for example, for the treatment of severe pain or attention deficit hyperactivity disorder) and have gotten into a routine of seeing their physician once every three months. Many such commenters were under the mistaken impression that, because of the Interim Policy Statement, they now must begin seeing their physician every month. DEA wishes to make clear that the Interim Policy did *not* state that such patients must visit their physician’s office every month to pick up a new prescription. There is no such requirement in the CSA or DEA regulations. What is required, in each instance where a physician issues a prescription for any controlled substance, is that the physician properly determine there is a legitimate medical purpose for the patient to be prescribed that controlled substance and that the physician be acting in the usual course of professional practice. 21 CFR 1306.04(a); *United States v. Moore*, 423 U.S. 122 (1975).

At the same time, schedule II controlled substances, by definition, have the highest potential for abuse, and are the most likely to cause dependence, of all the controlled substances that have an approved medical use. 21 U.S.C. 812(b). Physicians must, therefore, use the utmost care in determining whether their patients for whom they are prescribing schedule II controlled substances should be seen in person each time a prescription is issued or whether seeing the patient in person at somewhat less frequent intervals is consistent with sound medical practice and appropriate safeguards against diversion and misuse. Physicians must also abide by any requirements imposed by their state medical boards with respect to proper prescribing practices and what constitutes a bona fide physician-patient relationship. 21 U.S.C. 823(f)(1), (4).

3. Under the circumstances described in paragraph 2, in those instances where the physician (who regularly sees a patient) issues a prescription for a