

indicating that proposals must include a Data Management Plan that describes how funded researchers will conform to NSF policy on the dissemination and sharing of research results. The NSF policy is clear that “Investigators are expected to share with other researchers, at no more than incremental cost and within a reasonable time, the primary data, samples, physical collections and other supporting materials created or gathered in the course of work under NSF grants.” Such models may not necessarily be appropriate for all types of federally sponsored research.

As agencies consider how to further develop digital data policies, it is important to note that all policies for increasing accountability and access to digital data must follow statutory requirements and follow best practices for protecting confidentiality, personal privacy, proprietary interests, intellectual property rights, author attribution, and for ensuring that homeland and national security interests are not compromised.

The Working Group is now seeking additional insight from “non-Federal stakeholders, including the public, universities, nonprofit and for-profit publishers, libraries, federally funded and non-federally funded research scientists, and other organizations and institutions with an interest in long-term stewardship and improved public access to the results of federally funded research,” as described in Section 103(b)(6) of ACRA. Specifically the Working Group seeks further public comment on the questions listed below:

Preservation, Discoverability, and Access

(1) What specific Federal policies would encourage public access to and the preservation of broadly valuable digital data resulting from federally funded scientific research, to grow the U.S. economy and improve the productivity of the American scientific enterprise?

(2) What specific steps can be taken to protect the intellectual property interests of publishers, scientists, Federal agencies, and other stakeholders, with respect to any existing or proposed policies for encouraging public access to and preservation of digital data resulting from federally funded scientific research?

(3) How could Federal agencies take into account inherent differences between scientific disciplines and different types of digital data when developing policies on the management of data?

(4) How could agency policies consider differences in the relative costs and benefits of long-term stewardship and dissemination of different types of data resulting from federally funded research?

(5) How can stakeholders (e.g., research communities, universities, research institutions, libraries, scientific publishers) best contribute to the implementation of data management plans?

(6) How could funding mechanisms be improved to better address the real costs of preserving and making digital data accessible?

(7) What approaches could agencies take to measure, verify, and improve compliance with Federal data stewardship and access policies for scientific research? How can the burden of compliance and verification be minimized?

(8) What additional steps could agencies take to stimulate innovative use of publicly accessible research data in new and existing markets and industries to create jobs and grow the economy?

(9) What mechanisms could be developed to assure that those who produced the data are given appropriate attribution and credit when secondary results are reported?

Standards for Interoperability, Re-Use and Re-Purposing

(10) What digital data standards would enable interoperability, reuse, and repurposing of digital scientific data? For example, MIAME (minimum information about a microarray experiment; see Brazma *et al.*, 2001, *Nature Genetics* 29, 371) is an example of a community-driven data standards effort.

(11) What are other examples of standards development processes that were successful in producing effective standards and what characteristics of the process made these efforts successful?

(12) How could Federal agencies promote effective coordination on digital data standards with other nations and international communities?

(13) What policies, practices, and standards are needed to support linking between publications and associated data?

Response to this RFI is voluntary. Responders are free to address any or all the above items, as well as provide additional information that they think is relevant to developing policies consistent with increased preservation and dissemination of broadly useful digital data resulting from federally funded research. Please note that the

Government will not pay for response preparation or for the use of any information contained in the response.

How To Submit a Response

All comments must be submitted electronically to: digitaldata@ostp.gov.

Responses to this RFI will be accepted through January 12, 2012. You will receive an electronic confirmation acknowledging receipt of your response, but will not receive individualized feedback on any suggestions. No basis for claims against the U.S. Government shall arise as a result of a response to this request for information or from the Government’s use of such information.

Inquiries

Specific questions about this RFI should be directed to the following email address: digitaldata@ostp.gov. Form should include:

[Assigned ID #]
 [Assigned Entry date]
 Name/Email
 Affiliation/Organization
 City, State
 Comment 1
 Comment 2
 Comment 3
 Comment 4
 Comment 5
 Comment 6
 Comment 7
 Comment 8
 Comment 9
 Comment 10
 Comment 11

In addition, please identify any other items the Working Group might consider for Federal policies related to public access to peer-reviewed scholarly publications resulting from federally supported research.

Please attach any documents that support your comments to the questions.

Ted Wackler,

Deputy Chief of Staff.

[FR Doc. 2011–32947 Filed 12–22–11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY

Request for Information: Public Access to Peer-Reviewed Scholarly Publications Resulting From Federally Funded Research

ACTION: Notice of Request for Information (RFI).

SUMMARY: This RFI is being extended to change the response date to January 12, 2012. The RFI was published in the **Federal Register**, Volume 76, Number

214, on November 4, 2011, pages 68518–68520. In accordance with Section 103(b)(6) of the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2010 (ACRA; Pub. L. 111–358), this Request for Information (RFI) offers the opportunity for interested individuals and organizations to provide recommendations on approaches for ensuring long-term stewardship and broad public access to the peer-reviewed scholarly publications that result from federally funded scientific research. The public input provided through this Notice will inform deliberations of the National Science and Technology Council's Task Force on Public Access to Scholarly Publications.

Release Date: November 3, 2011.

Response Date: January 12, 2012.

ADDRESSES: *publicaccess@ostp.gov*.

Issued By: Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) on behalf of the National Science and Technology Council (NSTC).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Purpose

In accordance with Section 103(b)(6) of the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2010 (ACRA; Pub. L. 111–358), this Request for Information (RFI) offers the opportunity for interested individuals and organizations to provide recommendations on approaches for ensuring long-term stewardship and broad public access to the peer-reviewed scholarly publications that result from federally funded scientific research. The public input provided through this Notice will inform deliberations of the National Science and Technology Council's Task Force on Public Access to Scholarly Publications.

Background

The multi-agency Task Force on Public Access to Scholarly Publications (Task Force), established under the National Science and Technology Council (NSTC) Committee on Science (CoS), has been tasked with developing options for implementing the scholarly publications requirements of Section 103 of ACRA. OSTP will issue a report to Congress, in accordance with Section 103(e) of ACRA, describing priorities for the development of agency policies for ensuring broad public access to the results of federally funded unclassified research, the status of agency policies for public access to publications resulting from federally funded research, and a summary of public input collected from this RFI and other mechanisms.

In 2009 and 2010, OSTP conducted a public consultation about policy options for expanding public access to federally funded peer-reviewed scholarly articles. The Task Force has reviewed the information submitted through OSTP's public consultation (the full set of comments can be viewed on the OSTP Web site [<http://www.whitehouse.gov/blog/2010/03/08/public-access-policy-update>]), experience with the various policies currently in use at a variety of Federal agencies, and a report from the congressionally convened Scholarly Publishing Roundtable (<http://www.aau.edu/WorkArea/showcontent.aspx?id=10044>). The Task Force is now seeking additional insight from “non-Federal stakeholders, including the public, universities, nonprofit and for-profit publishers, libraries, federally funded and non-federally funded research scientists, and other organizations and institutions with a stake in long-term preservation and access to the results of federally funded research,” as described in Section 103(b)(6) of the ACRA. Specifically, OSTP seeks further public comment on the questions listed below, on behalf of the Task Force:

(1) Are there steps that agencies could take to grow existing and new markets related to the access and analysis of peer-reviewed publications that result from federally funded scientific research? How can policies for archiving publications and making them publicly accessible be used to grow the economy and improve the productivity of the scientific enterprise? What are the relative costs and benefits of such policies? What type of access to these publications is required to maximize U.S. economic growth and improve the productivity of the American scientific enterprise?

(2) What specific steps can be taken to protect the intellectual property interests of publishers, scientists, Federal agencies, and other stakeholders involved with the publication and dissemination of peer-reviewed scholarly publications resulting from federally funded scientific research? Conversely, are there policies that should not be adopted with respect to public access to peer-reviewed scholarly publications so as not to undermine any intellectual property rights of publishers, scientists, Federal agencies, and other stakeholders?

(3) What are the pros and cons of centralized and decentralized approaches to managing public access to peer reviewed scholarly publications that result from federally funded research in terms of interoperability, search, development of analytic tools, and other scientific and commercial

opportunities? Are there reasons why a Federal agency (or agencies) should maintain custody of all published content, and are there ways that the government can ensure long-term stewardship if content is distributed across multiple private sources?

(4) Are there models or new ideas for public-private partnerships that take advantage of existing publisher archives and encourage innovation in accessibility and interoperability, while ensuring long-term stewardship of the results of federally funded research?

(5) What steps can be taken by Federal agencies, publishers, and/or scholarly and professional societies to encourage interoperable search, discovery, and analysis capacity across disciplines and archives? What are the minimum core metadata for scholarly publications that must be made available to the public to allow such capabilities? How should Federal agencies make certain that such minimum core metadata associated with peer-reviewed publications resulting from federally funded scientific research are publicly available to ensure that these publications can be easily found and linked to Federal science funding?

(6) How can Federal agencies that fund science maximize the benefit of public access policies to U.S. taxpayers, and their investment in the peer-reviewed literature, while minimizing burden and costs for stakeholders, including awardee institutions, scientists, publishers, Federal agencies, and libraries?

(7) Besides scholarly journal articles, should other types of peer-reviewed publications resulting from federally funded research, such as book chapters and conference proceedings, be covered by these public access policies?

(8) What is the appropriate embargo period after publication before the public is granted free access to the full content of peer reviewed scholarly publications resulting from federally funded research? Please describe the empirical basis for the recommended embargo period. Analyses that weigh public and private benefits and account for external market factors, such as competition, price changes, library budgets, and other factors, will be particularly useful. Are there evidence-based arguments that can be made that the delay period should be different for specific disciplines or types of publications?

Please identify any other items the Task Force might consider for Federal policies related to public access to peer-reviewed scholarly publications resulting from federally supported research.

Response to this RFI is voluntary. Responders are free to address any or all the above items, as well as provide additional information that they think is relevant to developing policies consistent with increased public access to peer-reviewed scholarly publications resulting from federally funded research. Please note that the U.S. Government will not pay for response preparation or for the use of any information contained in the response.

How To Submit a Response

All comments must be submitted electronically to: publicaccess@ostp.gov.

Responses to this RFI will be accepted through January 12, 2012. You will receive an electronic confirmation acknowledging receipt of your response, but will not receive individualized feedback on any suggestions. No basis for claims against the U.S. Government shall arise as a result of a response to this request for information or from the Government's use of such information.

Inquiries

Specific questions about this RFI should be directed to the following email address: publicaccess@ostp.gov.

Form should include:

[Assigned ID #]

[Assigned Entry date]

Name/Email

Affiliation/Organization

City, State

Comment 1

Comment 2

Comment 3

Comment 4

Comment 5

Comment 6

Comment 7

Comment 8

Please identify any other items the Task Force might consider for Federal policies related to public access to peer-reviewed scholarly publications resulting from federally supported research.

{Attachment is: Please attach any documents that support your comments to the questions.}

Ted Wackler,

Deputy Chief of Staff.

[FR Doc. 2011-32943 Filed 12-22-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

Upon Written Request, Copies Available From: U.S. Securities and Exchange

Commission, Office of Investor Education and Advocacy, Washington, DC 20549-0213.

Extension:

Rule 24b-1, OMB Control No. 3235-0194, SEC File No. 270-205.

Notice is hereby given that pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*), the Securities and Exchange Commission ("Commission") has submitted to the Office of Management and Budget ("OMB") a request for approval of extension of the existing collection of information provided for in the following rule: Rule 24b01 (17 CFR 240.24b-1).

Rule 24b-1 under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78a *et seq.*) requires a national securities exchange to keep and make available for public inspection a copy of its registration statement and exhibits filed with the Commission, along with any amendments thereto.

There are 15 national securities exchanges that spend approximately one half hour each complying with this rule, for an aggregate total compliance burden of 7.5 hours per year. The staff estimates that the average cost per respondent is \$65.18 per year, calculated as the costs of copying (\$13.97) plus storage (\$51.21), resulting in a total cost of compliance for the respondents of \$977.70.

An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid control number.

The public may view the background documentation for this information collection at the following Web site, www.reginfo.gov. Comments should be directed to: (i) Desk Officer for the Securities and Exchange Commission, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, Room 10102, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20503 or by sending an email to Shagufta_Ahmed@omb.eop.gov; and (ii) Thomas Bayer, Director/Chief Information Officer, Securities and Exchange Commission, c/o Remi Pavlik-Simon, 6432 General Green Way, Alexandria, VA 22312 or send an email to PRA_Mailbox@sec.gov. Comments must be submitted within 30 days of this notice.

Dated: December 19, 2011.

Kevin M. O'Neill,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2011-32920 Filed 12-22-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8011-01-P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

Upon Written Request, Copies Available

From: Securities and Exchange Commission, Office of Investor Education and Advocacy, Washington, DC 20549-0213.

Extension:

Rule 19d-2, OMB Control No. 3235-0205, SEC File No. 270-204.

Notice is hereby given that pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 ("PRA") (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*) the Securities and Exchange Commission ("Commission") has submitted to the Office of Management and Budget ("OMB") a request for extension of the existing collection of information of Rule 19d-2 (17 CFR 240.19d-2) under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78a *et seq.*) ("Exchange Act").

Rule 19d-2 prescribes the form and content of applications to the Commission by persons desiring stays of final disciplinary sanctions and summary action of self-regulatory organizations ("SROs") for which the Commission is the appropriate regulatory agency.

It is estimated that approximately fifteen respondents will utilize this application procedure annually, with a total burden of 45 hours, based upon past submissions. The staff estimates that the average number of hours necessary to comply with the requirements of Rule 19d-2 is 3 hours.

Based on the most recent available information, the Commission staff estimates that the cost to respondents of complying with the requirements of Rule 19d-2 is \$876 per response. Therefore, the Commission staff estimates that the total annual reporting cost per respondent is \$876 (1 response/respondent/year × \$876 cost/response), for a total annual related cost to all respondents of \$13,140 (\$876 cost/respondent × 15 respondents).

The Commission may not conduct or sponsor a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid control number. No person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information subject to the PRA that does not display a valid Office of Management and Budget control number.

The public may view the background documentation for this information collection at the following Web site, www.reginfo.gov. Comments should be directed to: (i) Desk Officer for the Securities and Exchange Commission, Office of Information and Regulatory