with a contractor who is debarred, suspended, or proposed for debarment; and
(5) Recommending to the CG whether or not to continue current contracts with a contractor or subcontractor who is debarred, suspended, or proposed for debarment.

OGE will review for legal sufficiency:
(1) Referrals by AM to the debarment/suspension official;
(2) Recommendations by AM to the CG that GAO solicit offers from, award contracts to, or consent to subcontracts with a contractor who is listed in the EPLS debarred, suspended, or proposed for debarment;
(3) Recommendations by AM to the CG to terminate a current contract because a contractor or subcontractor was subsequently debarred, suspended, or proposed for debarment; and
(4) Notices of proposed debarment, notices of suspension, or any other communication to a contractor regarding that contractor’s potential or actual suspension or debarment.

Lynn H. Gibson,
General Counsel, U.S. Government Accountability Office.

[FR Doc. 2011–25228 Filed 9–29–11; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 1610–02–P

OFFICE OF GOVERNMENT ETHICS

Updated OGE Senior Executive Service Performance Review Board

AGENCY: Office of Government Ethics (OGE).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given of the appointment of members of the updated OGE Senior Executive Service (SES) Performance Review Board.

DATES: Effective Date: September 30, 2011.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: 5 U.S.C. 4314(c) requires each agency to establish, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Office of Personnel Management at 5 CFR part 430, subpart C and 430.310 thereof in particular, one or more Senior Executive Service (SES) performance review boards. As a small executive branch agency, OGE has just one board. In order to ensure an adequate level of staffing and to avoid a constant series of recusals, the designated members of OGE’s SES Performance Review Board are being drawn, as in the past, in large measure from the ranks of other agencies. The board shall review and evaluate the initial appraisal of each OGE senior executive’s performance by his or her supervisor, along with any recommendations in each instance to the appointing authority relative to the performance of the senior executive. This notice updates the membership of OGE’s SES Performance Review Board as it was most recently published at 75 FR 62540 (October 12, 2010).

Don W. Fox,
Acting Director, Office of Government Ethics.

The following officials have been appointed members of the SES Performance Review Board of the Office of Government Ethics:
Barbara Mullen-Roth [Chair], Deputy Director, Office of Government Ethics;
Leigh Bradley, Director, Standards of Conduct Office, Office of General Counsel, Office of the Secretary of Defense;
Melinda Loftin, Director, Departmental Ethics Office, Department of Interior;
David Magg, Chief, Ethics Law and Program Division, Office of the Assistant General Counsel for Administration, Department of Commerce; and
Robert Shapiro, Associate Solicitor for Legal Counsel, Department of Labor.

[FR Doc. 2011–25222 Filed 9–29–11; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6345–03–P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

[Document Identifier: 4150–30; 60-day Notice]

Agency Information Collection Request; 30-Day Public Comment Request

AGENCY: Office of the Secretary, HHS.

In compliance with the requirement of section 3506(c)(2)(A) of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, the Office of the Secretary (OS), Department of Health and Human Services, is publishing the following summary of a proposed information collection request for public comment. Interested persons are invited to send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including any of the following subjects:
(1) The necessity and utility of the proposed information collection for the proper performance of the agency’s functions; (2) the accuracy of the estimated burden; (3) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (4) the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology to minimize the information collection burden.

To obtain copies of the supporting statement and any related forms for the proposed paperwork collections referenced above, e-mail your request, including your address, phone number, OMB number, and OS document identifier, to Sherette.funncoleman@hhs.gov, or call the Reports Clearance Office on (202) 690–6162. Written comments and recommendations for the proposed information collections must be directed to the OS Paperwork Clearance Officer at the above email address within 60 days.

Proposed Project: The Office of Adolescent Health (OAH) Pregnancy Prevention Approaches Evaluation Baseline Data Collection-Transferring from ACF OMB No. 0970–0360 to OS OMB No. OS–0990–NEW.

Abstract: The Office of Adolescent Health (OAH), Office of the Assistant Secretary for Health (OASH), U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), is overseeing and coordinating adolescent pregnancy prevention evaluation efforts as part of the Teen Pregnancy Prevention Initiative. OAH is working collaboratively with the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation (ASPE), the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), and the Administration for Children and Families (ACF) on adolescent pregnancy prevention evaluation activities.

The Evaluation of Adolescent Pregnancy Prevention Approaches (PPA) is one of these efforts. PPA is a random assignment evaluation which will expand available evidence on effective ways to reduce teen pregnancy. The evaluation will document and test a range of pregnancy prevention approaches in up to eight program sites. The findings from the evaluation will be of interest to the general public, to policy-makers, and to organizations interested in teen pregnancy prevention.

OAH proposed baseline data collection activity as part of the PPA evaluation. A core baseline data collection instrument was approved on July 26, 2010. The project has worked in recent months to secure grants as evaluation sites, and as part of this effort the project has undertaken making revisions to the baseline instrument with each site. These changes were undertaken because each site has unique features (e.g. target population;