

suggest methods for performing more economically and share in any resulting savings or (2) are required to establish a program to identify and submit to the Government methods for performing more economically. These recommendations are submitted to the Government as value engineering change proposals (VECP's) and they must include specific information. This information is needed to enable the Government to evaluate the VECP and, if accepted, to arrange for an equitable sharing plan.

B. Annual Reporting Burden

Respondents: 400.

Responses per Respondent: 4.

Annual Responses: 1,600.

Hours per Response: 30.

Total Burden Hours: 48,000.

Obtaining Copies of Proposals:

Requesters may obtain a copy of the information collection documents from the General Services Administration, Regulatory Secretariat (VPR), 1800 F Street, NW., Room 4041, Washington, DC 20405, telephone (202) 501-4755. Please cite OMB Control No. 9000-0027, Value Engineering Requirements, in all correspondence.

Dated: June 23, 2009.

Al Matera,

Director, Office of Acquisition Policy.

[FR Doc. E9-15983 Filed 7-6-09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6820-EP-P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

[OMB Control No. 9000-0095]

Federal Acquisition Regulation; Information Collection; Commerce Patent Regulations

AGENCIES: Department of Defense (DOD), General Services Administration (GSA), and National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA).

ACTION: Notice of request for comments regarding the reinstatement of a previously existing OMB clearance.

SUMMARY: Under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35), the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Secretariat will be submitting to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) a request to review and approve a reinstatement of a previously approved information collection

requirement concerning Commerce Patent Regulations.

Public comments are particularly invited on: Whether this collection of information is necessary; whether it will have practical utility; whether our estimate of the public burden of this collection of information is accurate, and based on valid assumptions and methodology; ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and ways in which we can minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, through the use of appropriate technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

DATES: Submit comments on or before September 8, 2009.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to: General Services Administration (GSA), Regulatory Secretariat (VPR), 1800 F Street, NW., Room 4041, Washington, DC 20405. Please cite OMB Control No. 9000-0095, Commerce Patent Regulations, in all correspondence.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Ernest Woodson, Procurement Analyst, Contract Policy Division, GSA, (202) 501-3775.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

A. Purpose

As a result of the Department of Commerce (Commerce) publishing a final rule in the **Federal Register** implementing Public Law 98-620 (52 FR 8552, March 18, 1987), a revision to FAR subpart 27.3 to implement the Commerce regulation was published in the **Federal Register** as an interim rule on June 12, 1989 (54 FR 25060). The final rule was published without change on June 21, 1990.

A Government contractor must report all subject inventions to the contracting officer, submit a disclosure of the invention, and identify any publication, or sale, or public use of the invention (52.227-11(c), 52.227-12(c), and 52.227-13(e)(2)). Contractors are required to submit periodic or interim and final reports listing subject inventions (27.303(b)(2)(i) and (ii)). In order to ensure that subject inventions are reported, the contractor is required to establish and maintain effective procedures for identifying and disclosing subject inventions (52.227-11, Alternate IV; 52.227-13(e)(1)). In addition, the contractor must require his employees, by written agreements, to disclose subject inventions (52.227-

11(f)(2); 52.227-12(e)(2); 52.227-13(e)(4)). The contractor also has an obligation to utilize the subject invention, and agree to report, upon request, the utilization or efforts to utilize the subject invention (27.302(e); 52.227-11(f); 52.227-12(f)).

B. Annual Reporting Burden

Respondents: 1,200.

Responses per Respondent: 9.75.

Total Responses: 11,700.

Hours per Response: 3.9.

Total Burden Hours: 45,630.

Obtaining Copies of Proposals:

Requesters may obtain a copy of the information collection documents from the General Services Administration, Regulatory Secretariat (VPR), 1800 F Street, NW., Room 4041, Washington, DC 20405, telephone (202) 501-4755. Please cite OMB Control No. 9000-0095, Commerce Patent Regulations, in all correspondence.

Dated: June 23, 2009.

Al Matera,

Director, Office of Acquisition Policy.

[FR Doc. E9-15979 Filed 7-6-09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6820-EP-P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Office of the Secretary

Findings of Scientific Misconduct

AGENCY: Office of the Secretary, HHS.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the Office of Research Integrity (ORI) and the Assistant Secretary for Health have taken final action in the following case:

Juan Luis R. Contreras, M.D., University of Alabama at Birmingham: Based on a finding of scientific misconduct made by the University of Alabama at Birmingham (UAB) on January 24, 2008, a report of the UAB Investigation Committee, dated November 21, 2007, and analysis conducted by ORI during its oversight review, and further discussion between UAB and ORI to clarify UAB's investigative findings and decision with respect to the requirements of 42 CFR Parts 50 and 93, the U.S. Public Health Service (PHS) found that Dr. Juan Luis R. Contreras, Assistant Professor, Department of Surgery—Transplantation, UAB, engaged in scientific misconduct in research supported by National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (NIAID), National Institutes of Health (NIH), grants R01 AI22293, R01 AI39793, and

U19 AI056542, National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases (NIDDK), NIH, grant U19 DK57958, and NIH/Novartis Cooperative Research and Development Agreement 96–MH–01/NIHITC–0697.

PHS found that Respondent engaged in scientific misconduct by falsifying in seven publications reports of research results in NIH-supported experiments with non-human primate (NHP) renal allograft recipients.

Specifically, PHS found that Respondent engaged in scientific misconduct by falsely reporting in five publications¹ that at least 32 specific non-human primates in a renal allograft transplantation study had received bilateral nephrectomies, while in fact an intrinsic kidney was left in place in each animal, and generally, in two additional publications² by reporting that all long term surviving non-human primate renal allograft recipients had

¹ Hutchings, A., Wu, J., Asiedu, C., Hubbard, W., Eckhoff, D., Contreras, J., Thomas, F.T., Neville, D., & Thomas, J.M. "The immune decision toward allograft tolerance in non-human primates requires early inhibition of innate immunity and induction of immune regulation." *Transpl Immunol.* 11(3–4):335–344, July–September 2003. (Retraction required by UAB.)

Thomas, J.M., Eckhoff, D.E., Contreras, J.L., Lobashevsky, A.L., Hubbard, W.J., Moore, J.K., Cook, W.J., Thomas, F.T., & Neville, D.M. Jr. "Durable donor-specific T and B cell tolerance in rhesus macaques induced with peritransplantation anti-CD3 immunotoxin and deoxyspergualin: Absence of chronic allograft nephropathy." *Transplantation* 69(12):2497–2503, June 27, 2000. (Retracted.)

Thomas, J.M., Contreras, J.L., Jiang, X.L., Eckhoff, D.E., Wang, P.X., Hubbard, W.J., Lobashevsky, A.L., Wang, W., Asiedu, C., Stavrou, S., Cook, W.J., Robbin, M.L., Thomas, F.T., & Neville, D.M. Jr. "Peritransplant tolerance induction in macaques: Early events reflecting the unique synergy between immunotoxin and deoxyspergualin." *Transplantation* 68(11):1660–1673, December 15, 1999. (Retracted.)

Contreras, J.L., Eckhoff, D.E., Cartner, S., Frenette, L., Thomas, F.T., Robbin, M.L., Neville, D.M. Jr., & Thomas, J.M. "Tolerability and side effects of anti-CD3-immunotoxin in preclinical testing in kidney and pancreatic islet transplant recipients." *Transplantation* 68(2):215–219, July 27, 1999. (Retracted.)

Contreras, J.L., Wang, P.X., Eckhoff, D.E., Lobashevsky, A.L., Asiedu, C., Frenette, L., Robbin, M.L., Hubbard, W.J., Cartner, S., Nadler, S., Cook, W.J., Sharff, J., Shiloach, J., Thomas, F.T., Neville, D.M. Jr., & Thomas, J.M. "Peritransplant tolerance induction with anti-CD3-immunotoxin: A matter of proinflammatory cytokine control." *Transplantation* 65(9):1159–1169, May 15, 1998. (Retracted.)

² Hubbard, W.J., Eckhoff, D., Contreras, J.L., Thomas, F.T., Hutchings, A., & Thomas, J.M. "STEALTH on the preclinical path to tolerance." *Graft* 5(6):322–330, 2002. (Retraction required by UAB—Journal has ceased publication.)

Hubbard, W.J., Contreras, J.V., Eckhoff, D.E., Thomas, F.T., Neville, D.M., & Thomas, J.M. "Immunotoxins and tolerance induction in primates." *Current Opinion in Organ Transplantation* 5:29–34, 2000. (Partially retracted.)

received bilateral nephrectomies of their native kidneys.

The objective of the research was to test the effectiveness of different immunomodulating agents, administered around the time of renal transplantation in non-human primates, in preventing rejection of the transplanted kidney. To determine whether or not the transplanted kidney was functioning (able to sustain life) after the immunomodulating therapy, the animals were to have both of their native kidneys removed at or shortly after the time of transplant, so that their survival would depend solely on the viability of the transplanted kidney. Failure to remove both native kidneys rendered it impossible to assess the effectiveness of the immunomodulating treatment.

Both Dr. Contreras and PHS are desirous of concluding this matter without further expense of time and other resources, and the parties have entered into a Voluntary Exclusion Agreement to settle the matter. Dr. Contreras accepted responsibility for the reporting described above, but denied that he intentionally committed scientific misconduct. The settlement is not an admission of liability on the part of the Respondent.

Dr. Contreras has entered into a Voluntary Exclusion Agreement in which he has voluntarily agreed, for a period of three (3) years, beginning on June 17, 2009:

(1) To exclude himself voluntarily from any contracting or subcontracting with any agency of the United States Government and from eligibility or involvement in nonprocurement programs of the United States Government referred to as "covered transactions" and defined by 2 CFR Parts 180 and 376; and

(2) To exclude himself from serving in any advisory capacity to PHS, including but not limited to service on any PHS advisory committee, board, and/or peer review committee, or as a consultant.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:
Director, Division of Investigative Oversight, Office of Research Integrity, 1101 Wootton Parkway, Suite 750, Rockville, MD 20852, (240) 453–8800.

John Dahlberg,

Director, Division of Investigative Oversight, Office of Research Integrity.

[FR Doc. E9–15909 Filed 7–6–09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4150–31–P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Administration for Children and Families

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

Title: Developmental Disabilities Program Independent Evaluation Project.

OMB No.: New Collection.

Description: The Developmental Disabilities Program Independent Evaluation (DDPIE) Project is an independent (non-biased) evaluation to examine through rigorous and comprehensive performance-based research procedures the targeted impact on the lives of people with developmental disabilities and their families of three programs funded under the Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act of 2000 (DD Act): (1) State Councils on Developmental Disabilities (SCDDs); (2) State Protection and Advocacy Systems for Individuals with developmental disabilities (P&As); and (3) University Centers for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities (UCEDDs). The intent of this evaluation is to understand and report on the accomplishments of these programs, including collaborative efforts among the DD Network programs. The results of this evaluation will provide a report to the Administration on Developmental Disabilities (ADD) (the agency that administers these programs) with information on the effectiveness of its programs and policies and serve as a way for ADD to promote accountability to the public.

The independent evaluation is a response to accountability requirements for ADD as identified in the Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act of 2000 (DD Act), the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) of 1993, and the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART), administered by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). This project meets the requirements of PART by providing a non-biased method of evaluating the effectiveness and impact of DD Network programs on the lives of people with developmental disabilities and their families.

ADD is seeking OMB approval for the evaluation tools (e.g., data collection instruments). The evaluation tools are designed to collect data for two purposes: (1) To measure the programs according to indicators (structural, process, output, and outcome) in key function areas; and (2) to establish performance standards for measuring