

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

arbitration panel was convened on December 8 and December 9, 2009.

Synopsis of the Arbitration Panel Decision

After reviewing all of the testimony and evidence, the panel found that most of the grievances were time barred, either by operation of the 15-day time limit set forth in the New Jersey Administrative Code, the doctrine of laches, or both. The panel further determined that Complainant did not show that the SLA had violated the Act or the Federal and State implementing regulations. Accordingly, the panel majority concluded that Complainant was not entitled to any remedy with the exception of Complainant's claim for the costs, including reasonable attorney's fees, he incurred in the State evidentiary hearing.

However, with respect to the State fair hearing, the panel majority concluded that the SLA knew, or had reason to know, prior to the commencement of the ALJ hearing, that Complainant's case would require the ALJ to interpret two potentially conflicting Federal statutes and, as a result, that the ALJ might lack subject matter jurisdiction. Yet, the SLA allowed the ALJ hearing to take place and asked the ALJ to return the case after Complainant had submitted his post-hearing brief requiring significant time and resources to no avail. Thus, the panel majority ruled that fundamental principles of fairness require that the SLA reimburse Complainant for the costs expended by Complainant in the State fair hearing, including reasonable attorney's fees.

The panel also retained jurisdiction of this matter for the sole purpose of resolving any disputes regarding the amount the SLA must pay Complainant for those costs.

One panel member dissented in part and concurred in part. This panel member dissented from the panel's determination that the commission payment was neither timely protested by Complainant nor a violation of the Act but concurred with the panel majority regarding the SLA's reimbursement to Complainant for costs incurred in the State fair hearing, including reasonable attorney's fees.

On January 11, 2011, the SLA sought reconsideration of the portion of the panel's award granting Complainant the costs he incurred in the State fair hearing, including reasonable attorney's fees.

The panel agreed to consider the SLA's motion and granted Complainant the opportunity to reply, which he did on or about March 2, 2011.

On March 25, 2011, the panel conferred via conference call. After reviewing the parties' motions including the legal authority cited, the panel unanimously denied the SLA's motion for reconsideration on the merits and affirmed its initial decision of September 18, 2010, to award Complainant his costs for the State fair hearing, including reasonable attorney's fees.

The views and opinions expressed by the panel do not necessarily represent the views and opinions of the Department.

Electronic Access to This Document: The Official version of this document is the document published in the **Federal Register**. Free Internet access to the official edition of the **Federal Register** and the Code of Federal Regulations is available via the Federal Digital System at: www.gpo.gov/fdsys. At this site you can view this document, as well as all other documents of this Department published in the **Federal Register**, in text or Adobe Portable Document Format (PDF). To use PDF you must have Adobe Acrobat Reader, which is available free at the site.

You may also access documents of the Department published in the **Federal Register** by using the article search feature at www.federalregister.gov. Specifically, through the advanced search feature at this site, you can limit your search to documents published by the Department.

Dated: January 11, 2012.

Alexa Posny,

Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services.

[FR Doc. 2012-749 Filed 1-13-12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4000-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

[Docket ID: ED-2012-OESE-0003]

Request for Information To Gather Technical Expertise Pertaining to Testing Integrity

AGENCY: Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Department of Education.

ACTION: Request for information.

SUMMARY: In light of recent, high-profile reports of misconduct by school officials in the test administration process, the U.S. Department of Education ("the Department" or "we") is seeking to collect and share information about best practices that have been used to prevent, detect, and respond to irregularities in academic testing. To that end, the Department is taking

several steps, described below, to collect information and gather suggestions to assist State educational agencies (SEAs), local educational agencies (LEAs), and the testing-integrity-focused organizations that service them. The Department anticipates making use of this information to facilitate further dialogue and to help SEAs and LEAs identify, share, and implement best practices for preventing, detecting, and investigating irregularities in academic testing.

First, the Department is issuing this request for information (RFI) to collect information about the integrity of academic testing. We pose a series of questions to which we invite interested members of the public to respond. Second, the Department will host a symposium where external experts can engage in further discussion and probe these issues in greater depth.

Third, the Department will publish a document that contains a summary of the recommendations that were developed as a result of the RFI and the symposium, as well as other resources identified by external experts participating in the symposium.

DATES: Written submissions must be received by the Department on or before 5 p.m., Washington, DC time, on February 16, 2012.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments through the Federal eRulemaking Portal or via postal mail, commercial delivery, or hand delivery. We will not accept comments by fax or by email. To ensure that we do not receive duplicate copies, please submit your comments only one time. In addition, please include the Docket ID and the term "Testing Integrity response" at the top of your comments.

- *Federal eRulemaking Portal:* Go to <http://www.regulations.gov> to submit your comments electronically. Information on using Regulations.gov, including instructions for accessing agency documents, submitting comments, and viewing the docket, is available on the site under "How To Use This Site."

- *Postal Mail, Commercial Delivery, or Hand Delivery:* If you mail or deliver your comments, address them to Carlos Martinez, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Attention: Testing Integrity RFI, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue SW., room 3W104, Washington, DC 20202-6132.

- *Privacy Note:* The Department's policy for comments received from members of the public (including comments submitted by mail, commercial delivery, or hand delivery)