

3 p.m. ....	Break	Mr. William Caniano, Designated Federal Official, Mrs. Mary Margaret Graham, Chairman.
3:10 p.m. ....	Discussions and Deliberations .....	
4 p.m. ....	Adjourn	

Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b, as amended, and 41 CFR 102–3.155, the Director, DIA, has determined that the all meetings shall be closed to the public. The Director, DIA, in consultation with the DIA Office of the General Counsel, has determined in writing that the public interest requires that all sessions of the Board's meetings be closed to the public because they include discussions of classified information and matters covered by 5 U.S.C. 552b(c)(1).

#### Written Statements

Pursuant to 41 CFR 102–3.105(j) and 102–3.140, and section 10(a)(3) of the Federal Advisory Board Committee Act of 1972, the public or interested organizations may submit written statements at any time to the DIA Advisory Board regarding its missions and functions. All written statements shall be submitted to the Designated Federal Official for the DIA Advisory Board. The Designated Federal Official will ensure that written statements are provided to the Board for its consideration. Written statements may also be submitted in response to the stated agenda of planned board meetings. Statements submitted in response to this notice must be received by the Designated Federal Official at least five calendar days prior to the meeting which is the subject of this notice. Written statements received after that date may not be provided or considered by the Board until its next meeting. All submissions provided before that date will be presented to the Board before the meeting that is subject of this notice. Contact information for the Designated Federal Official is listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**.

Dated: January 11, 2012.

**Aaron Siegel,**

*Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.*

[FR Doc. 2012–657 Filed 1–13–12; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 5001–06–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

### Department of the Army

#### Notice of Availability for Exclusive, Non-Exclusive, or Partially-Exclusive Licensing of an Invention Concerning a Method and Device for Detection of Bioavailable Drug Concentration in a Fluid Sample

**AGENCY:** Department of the Army, DOD.

**ACTION:** Notice; correction.

**SUMMARY:** The notice published in the *Federal Register* on January 6, 2012 (77 FR 783) contained an incorrect U.S. Provisional Patent Application Serial No. The correct number is 61/105,604.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** For patent issues, Ms. Elizabeth Arwine, Patent Attorney, (301) 619–7808. For licensing issues, Dr. Paul Mele, Office of Research and Technology Applications (ORTA), (301) 619–6664, both at telefax (301) 619–5034.

**Brenda S. Bowen,**

*Army Federal Register Liaison Officer.*

[FR Doc. 2012–649 Filed 1–13–12; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3710–08–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

### Department of the Army

#### Intent To Grant an Exclusive License for a U.S. Army Owned Invention to Triumph Actuation Systems—CT, LLC

**AGENCY:** Department of the Army, DoD.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of the Army announces that, unless there is objection, after 15 days it will grant an exclusive license to Triumph Actuation Systems—Connecticut, LLC, of Bloomfield, CT in U.S. patent 7,228,779, issued June 12, 2007, “Automatic Primer Feed Mechanism”; U.S. patent 7,246,549, issued July 24, 2007, “Automatic Primer Feed Mechanism”; U.S. patent 7,318,369, issued January 15, 2008, “Out-of-Battery Lock for the Automatic Primer Feed Mechanism”; U.S. patent 7,845,264, issued December 7, 2010, “Automatic Primer Feed Mechanism”. Any license granted shall comply with 35 U.S.C. 209 and 37 CFR Part 404.

**DATES:** File written objections by February 1, 2012.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mr. Timothy S. Ryan, Technology Transfer Program Manager, RDAR–EIB, U.S. Army ARDEC, Picatinny Arsenal, NJ 07806–5000, email: *timothy.s.ryan@us.army.mil*; (973) 724–7953.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Written objections must be filed within 15 days from publication date of this notice in the *Federal Register*. Any license granted shall comply with 35 U.S.C. 209 and 37 CFR 404.

**Brenda S. Bowen,**

*Army Federal Register Liaison Officer.*

[FR Doc. 2012–648 Filed 1–13–12; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3710–08–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

### Defense Acquisition Regulations System

#### Waiver for Certain Defense Items Produced in the United Kingdom

**AGENCY:** Defense Acquisition Regulations System, Department of Defense (DoD).

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics) is waiving the statutory limitation for certain defense items produced in the United Kingdom (UK). The law limits DoD procurement of certain items to sources in the national technology and industrial base. The waiver will permit procurement of enumerated items from sources in the UK, unless otherwise restricted by statute.

**DATES:** This waiver is effective beginning February 1, 2012, until February 1, 2013.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ms. Patricia Foley, OUSD (AT&L), Office of the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Contract Policy and International Contracting, Room 5E621, 3060 Defense Pentagon, Washington, DC 20301–3060, telephone (703) 693–1145.

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

Subsection (a) of 10 U.S.C. 2534 provides that the Secretary of Defense may procure the items listed in that subsection only if the manufacturer of the item is part of the national technology and industrial base. Subsection (i) of 10 U.S.C. 2534 authorizes the Secretary of Defense to

exercise the waiver authority in subsection (d) on the basis of the applicability of paragraph (2) or (3) of that subsection, only if the waiver is made for a particular item listed in subsection (a) and for a particular foreign country. Subsection (d) authorizes a waiver if the Secretary determines that application of the limitation “would impede the reciprocal procurement of defense items under a memorandum of understanding providing for reciprocal procurement of defense items” and if he determines that “that country does not discriminate against defense items produced in the United States to a greater degree than the United States discriminates against defense items produced in that country.” The Secretary of Defense has delegated the waiver authority of 10 U.S.C. 2534(d) to the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics).

DoD has had a Reciprocal Defense Procurement Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the UK since 1975, most recently renewed on December 16, 2004.

The Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics) finds that the UK does not discriminate against defense items produced in the United States to a greater degree than the United States discriminates against defense items produced in the UK, and also finds that application of the limitation in 10 U.S.C. 2534 against defense items produced in the UK would impede the reciprocal procurement of defense items under the MOU.

Under the authority of 10 U.S.C. 2534, the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics) has determined that application of the limitation of 10 U.S.C. 2534(a) to the procurement of any defense item produced in the UK that is listed below would impede the reciprocal procurement of defense items under the MOU with the UK.

On the basis of the foregoing, the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics) is waiving the limitation in 10 U.S.C. 2534(a) for procurements of any defense item listed below that is produced in the UK. This waiver applies only to the limitations in 10 U.S.C. 2534(a). It does not apply to any other limitation, including section 8016 of the DoD Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Pub. L. 112–74). This waiver applies to procurements under solicitations issued during the period from February 1, 2012, to February 1, 2013. Similar waivers have been granted since 1998,

most recently in 2010 (75 FR 76447, December 8, 2010).

#### List of Items to Which This Waiver Applies

1. Air circuit breakers.
2. Welded shipboard anchor and mooring chain with a diameter of four inches or less.
3. Gyrocompasses.
4. Electronic navigation chart systems.
5. Steering controls.
6. Pumps.
7. Propulsion and machinery control systems.
8. Totally enclosed lifeboats.

**Ynette R. Shelkin,**

*Editor, Defense Acquisition Regulations System.*

[FR Doc. 2012–647 Filed 1–13–12; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 5001–06–P**

---

## DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

### Arbitration Panel Decision Under the Randolph-Sheppard Act

**AGENCY:** Department of Education.

**ACTION:** Notice of decision.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Education (Department) gives notice that on September 18, 2010, an arbitration panel rendered a decision in the matter of *John Bell, et al. v. New Jersey Commission for the Blind and Visually Impaired*, Case no. R–S/07–14.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** You may obtain a copy of the full text of the arbitration panel decision from Mary Yang, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue SW., room 5162, Potomac Center Plaza, Washington, DC 20202–2800. Telephone: (202) 245–6327. If you use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD), call the Federal Relay Service (FRS), toll free, at 1–(800) 877–8339.

Individuals with disabilities can obtain this document in an accessible format (e.g., braille, large print, audiotape, or compact disc) by contacting the program contact person listed in this section.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** This arbitration panel was convened by the Department under 20 U.S.C. 107d-1(a), after receiving a complaint from the Complainant, John Bell. Under section 6(c) of the Randolph-Sheppard Act (Act), 20 U.S.C. 107d-2(c), the Secretary publishes in the **Federal Register** a synopsis of each arbitration panel decision affecting the administration of vending facilities on Federal and other property.

## Background

John Bell (Complainant) alleged violations by the New Jersey Commission for the Blind and Visually Impaired, the State licensing agency (SLA), under the Act and implementing regulations in 34 CFR part 395. Complainant alleged that the SLA violated the Act, the implementing regulations and the New Jersey Administrative Code concerning Complainant’s management of a facility comprised of laundry equipment and vending machines at the Fairton Federal Correction Institution (Fairton) operated by the Federal Bureau of Prisons (BOP) at Fairton, New Jersey.

Specifically, Complainant alleged that the SLA unlawfully (1) entered into an “intergovernmental agreement” with BOP rather than a “permit” for the Fairton facility; (2) allowed BOP to collect 15 percent of Complainant’s net sales, as opposed to net profit; (3) allowed BOP to improperly change the rate charged for laundry services; (4) failed to pay the cost of replacing certain laundry machines in 2003 and/or failed to reimburse Complainant for \$48,000 for the lease purchase agreement he signed to replace the laundry machines himself; (5) required Complainant to pay the first \$200 in repair costs for each machine breakdown; and (6) failed to provide Complainant with a State fair hearing.

Complainant requested that the arbitration panel grant the following relief: (1) Damages of approximately \$440,000; (2) an order directing the SLA to file an arbitration against the BOP regarding the 15 percent that Complainant paid to BOP; (3) a recommendation from the panel to the Secretary of Education that the New Jersey Commission for the Blind and Visually Impaired be removed as the SLA under the Act based upon its failure to provide Complainant with a full State fair hearing; and (4) costs incurred in this proceeding, including reasonable attorney’s fees.

Complainant filed for a State fair hearing of his complaint, which was held on October 23, 2007. The Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) set January 15, 2008, as the date for the parties to submit post-hearing briefs. However, prior to the decision, the SLA requested that the ALJ return the case to it. Complainant opposed the request, but the ALJ advised Complainant that under New Jersey law he was required to relinquish the case back to the SLA.

Subsequently, Complainant filed with the Department a request for Federal arbitration seeking an appeal of the State fair hearing decision. A Federal