

suitability for Federal employment; investigations for employment in a sensitive national security position; investigations for eligibility for access to classified information; investigations for fitness for employment in the excepted service or as a contract employee; and investigations for identity credentials for long-term physical and logical access to Federally controlled facilities and information systems. Further, there are adequate protections against the unauthorized redisclosure of reports of investigation in the Privacy Act. *See Nelson*, 131 S. Ct. at 762–64. Additional protections are found in section 9(c) of E.O. 10450, as amended, and in agency restrictions on the release of personally identifiable information.

c. NTEU commented that the forms request information beyond that to which the employee has consented in the Authorization for Release of Information as there is no indication that information regarding general behavior and conduct will be solicited from individuals who might offer information regarding personal habits. The commenter is incorrect. The authorization is part of a questionnaire that specifically informs the subject that the investigative process is designed to develop information to show “whether you are reliable and trustworthy, and of good conduct and character.”

d. NTEU commented that the forms do not adequately explain the purpose for which the information is sought and its routine nature, and therefore allow the reference to infer that the subject is under suspicion of wrongdoing. OPM has received no evidence to support this suggestion during its longstanding use of these forms. The form instructions make clear that the form is part of a background vetting process, not part of a criminal or disciplinary proceeding.

An OPM investigator commented that the INV 44 should instruct responding law enforcement agencies to withhold traffic violations if the fine was less than \$300 and did not involve alcohol or drugs, since subjects of national security investigations are not required to disclose such violations on their SF 86, Questionnaire for National Security Positions. OPM does not accept this recommendation at this time because (1) the INV 44 is used for investigations based on other investigative questionnaires (SF 85, SF 85P) which do not include exceptions for traffic violations that resulted in fines less than \$300; and (2) subjecting responding law enforcement agencies to the burden of parsing such violations from their records when responding to OPM requests may deter responses or result in response errors.

OPM is proposing to modify INV forms 40, 41, and 42 to provide instruction to respondents to mark, by making a check, when the respondent requests confidentiality of his or her identity, and to call an office at OPM to receive approval of the request before completing the form. The purpose of this change is to more clearly establish the granting of confidentiality as permitted by the Privacy Act of 1974 and OPM’s implementing regulations.

U.S. Office of Personnel Management.

John Berry,

Director.

[FR Doc. 2011–4353 Filed 2–25–11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6325–53–P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Sunshine Act Meeting

Notice is hereby given, pursuant to the provisions of the Government in the Sunshine Act, Public Law 94–409, that the Securities and Exchange Commission will hold a Closed Meeting on Thursday, March 3, 2011 at 2 p.m.

Commissioners, Counsel to the Commissioners, the Secretary to the Commission, and recording secretaries will attend the Closed Meeting. Certain staff members who have an interest in the matters also may be present.

The General Counsel of the Commission, or his designee, has certified that, in his opinion, one or more of the exemptions set forth in 5 U.S.C. 552b(c)(3), (5), (7), 9(B) and (10) and 17 CFR 200.402(a)(3), (5), (7), 9(ii) and (10), permit consideration of the scheduled matters at the Closed Meeting.

Commissioner Casey, as duty officer, voted to consider the items listed for the Closed Meeting in a closed session.

The subject matter of the Closed Meeting scheduled for Thursday, March 3, 2011 will be:

Institution and settlement of injunctive actions;
Institution and settlement of administrative proceedings; and
Other matters relating to enforcement proceedings.

At times, changes in Commission priorities require alterations in the scheduling of meeting items.

For further information and to ascertain what, if any, matters have been added, deleted or postponed, please contact:

The Office of the Secretary at (202) 551–5400.

Dated: February 24, 2011.

Elizabeth M. Murphy,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2011–4500 Filed 2–24–11; 4:15 pm]

BILLING CODE 8011–01–P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[File No. 500–1]

Bio-Life Labs, Inc., BSI2000, Inc., Calais Resources, Inc., EGX Funds Transfer, Inc., Great Western Land Recreation, Inc. (a/k/a Great Western Land and Recreation, Inc.), and Id-CONFIRM, Inc., Order of Suspension of Trading

February 24, 2011.

It appears to the Securities and Exchange Commission that there is a lack of current and accurate information concerning the securities of Bio-Life Labs, Inc. because it has not filed any periodic reports since the period ended March 31, 2005.

It appears to the Securities and Exchange Commission that there is a lack of current and accurate information concerning the securities of BSI2000, Inc. because it has not filed any periodic reports since the period ended December 31, 2005.

It appears to the Securities and Exchange Commission that there is a lack of current and accurate information concerning the securities of Calais Resources, Inc. because it has not filed any periodic reports since the period ended August 31, 2004.

It appears to the Securities and Exchange Commission that there is a lack of current and accurate information concerning the securities of EGX Funds Transfer, Inc. because it has not filed any periodic reports since the period ended December 31, 2002.

It appears to the Securities and Exchange Commission that there is a lack of current and accurate information concerning the securities of Great Western Land Recreation, Inc. (a/k/a Great Western Land and Recreation, Inc.) because it has not filed any periodic reports since the period ended June 30, 2006.

It appears to the Securities and Exchange Commission that there is a lack of current and accurate information concerning the securities of Id-CONFIRM, Inc. because it has not filed any periodic reports since the period ended March 31, 2007.

The Commission is of the opinion that the public interest and the protection of investors require a suspension of trading in the securities of the above-listed

companies. Therefore, it is ordered, pursuant to Section 12(k) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, that trading in the securities of the above-listed companies is suspended for the period from 9:30 a.m. EST on February 24, 2011, through 11:59 p.m. EST on March 9, 2011.

By the Commission.

Jill M. Peterson,

Assistant Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2011-4496 Filed 2-24-11; 4:15 pm]

BILLING CODE 8011-01-P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34-63946; File No. SR-MSRB-2011-03]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board; Notice of Filing of Amendments to Rule G-23, on Activities of Financial Advisors

February 22, 2011.

Pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (“the Act” or “the Exchange Act”) ¹ and Rule 19b-4 thereunder,² notice is hereby given that on February 9, 2011, the Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board (“Board” or “MSRB”) filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (“SEC” or “Commission”) the proposed rule change as described in Items I and II below, which Items have been prepared by the MSRB. 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 MSRB is filing with the SEC a proposed rule change consisting of (i) proposed amendments to Rule G-23 (activities of financial advisors) and (ii) a proposed interpretation of Rule G-23 (the “proposed interpretive notice”). The MSRB requests that the proposed rule change be made effective for new issues for which the Time of Formal Award (as defined in Rule G-34(a)(ii)(C)(1)(a)) occurs more than six (6) months after SEC approval to allow issuers of municipal securities time to finalize any outstanding transactions that might be affected by the proposed rule change.

The text of the proposed rule change is available on the MSRB’s Web site at <http://www.msrb.org/Rules-and-Interpretations/SEC-Filings/2011->

Filings.aspx, at the MSRB’s principal office, and at the Commission’s Public Reference Room.

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

In its filing with the Commission, the MSRB 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. The Board has prepared summaries, set forth in Sections A, B, and C below, of the most significant aspects of such statements.

A. Self-Regulatory Organization’s Statement of the Purpose of, and Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change

1. Purpose

(a) Currently Rule G-23, on activities of financial advisors, sets forth the circumstances under which a broker, dealer, or municipal securities dealer (“dealer”) acting as a financial advisor to an issuer with respect to a new issue or issues of municipal securities (“dealer financial advisor”) may acquire all or any portion of such issue, directly or indirectly, from the issuer as a principal, or may act as agent for the issuer in arranging the placement of such issue, either alone or as a participant in a syndicate or other similar account formed for that purpose. For negotiated transactions, Rule G-23(d)(i) requires that: (i) The dealer terminate the financial advisory relationship with regard to the issue and at or after such termination the issuer expressly consent in writing to such acquisition or participation; (ii) at or before such termination, the dealer disclose in writing to the issuer that there may be a conflict of interest in changing from the capacity of financial advisor to that of purchaser of or placement agent for the securities and the issuer expressly acknowledges in writing to the dealer receipt of such disclosure; and (iii) the dealer disclose in writing to the issuer at or before such termination the source and anticipated amount of all remuneration to the dealer with respect to such issue and the issuer expressly acknowledge in writing to the dealer receipt of such disclosure. With respect to issues sold by competitive bid, Rule G-23(d)(ii) provides that a financial advisor must obtain the issuer’s written consent prior to making a bid for the issue.

The limitations of Rule G-23(d) also apply to affiliates of the dealer financial advisor; however, they do not apply to purchases by dealer financial advisors of securities from an underwriter, either for the account of the dealer financial advisor or for the account of customers of the dealer financial advisor, except to the extent that such purchases are made to contravene the purpose and intent of the rule.

In addition, Rule G-23(e) provides that a dealer that has a financial advisory relationship with respect to a new issue of municipal securities may not act as agent for the issuer in remarketing such issue unless the dealer has disclosed in writing to the issuer:

(i) That there may be a conflict of interest in acting as both financial advisor and remarketing agent for the securities; and (ii) the source and basis of the remuneration the dealer could earn as remarketing agent on such issue. The dealer must receive from the issuer its express acknowledgement, in writing, of its receipt of such disclosure and its consent to the financial advisor acting in both capacities along with the source and basis of remuneration.

The proposed amendments would, subject to the exceptions described below, (i) prohibit a dealer financial advisor with respect to the issuance of municipal securities from acquiring all or any portion of such issue directly or indirectly, from the issuer as principal, or acting as agent for the issuer in arranging the placement of such issue, either alone or as a participant in a syndicate or other similar account formed for that purpose; (ii) apply the same prohibition to any dealer controlling, controlled by, or under common control with the dealer financial advisor; and (iii) prohibit a dealer financial advisor from acting as the remarketing agent for such issue.

The proposed amendments would not prohibit: (i) A dealer financial advisor from placing an issuer’s entire issue with another governmental entity, such as a bond bank, as part of a plan of financing by such entity for or on behalf of the dealer financial advisor’s issuer client;³ (ii) a dealer financial advisor from serving as successor remarketing agent to an issuer for the same issue with respect to which it provided financial advisory services if the financial advisory relationship with the issuer had been terminated for at least

³ The exception would only apply if the dealer financial advisor did not receive compensation for the placement of such issue and the dealer financial advisor was not compensated as an underwriter in connection with any related transaction undertaken by the governmental entity with which such issue is placed.

¹ 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

² 17 CFR 240.19b-4.