ADDITIONS: The workshop will be held in the Nordby Conference Room, Fisherman’s Terminal, 3919 18th Avenue West, Seattle, WA 98119–1679.


SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The workshop is being held to review preliminary draft EDR forms for catcher vessels, catcher/processors, shore-side crab processors, and stationary floating crab processors participating in the Crab Rationalization Program fisheries, as well as Registered Crab Receivers that participate in the fisheries as non-processing crab buyers. The preliminary draft EDR forms are intended to implement changes to the crab EDR requirements recommended by the North Pacific Fishery Management Council (Council) on February 4, 2012.

The Council’s preferred alternative for crab EDR revisions eliminates redundant data reporting by removing requirements to report data that is collected through other sources. It also eliminates data inaccuracies in order to reduce the cost of collecting the data, and clarifies EDR form instructions to reduce the burden on those required to complete the forms. More information on the Council recommendation and a description of the preferred alternative, Modified Alternative 3, can be accessed at the link below.

The workshop is intended to gather input from participants on the preliminary draft EDR forms. Feedback received during the workshop will also be used by NMFS to develop the proposed rule to implement the Council’s preferred alternative. Other topics to be addressed at the workshop include general planning for administration of the EDR process by NMFS’ Data Collection Agent (Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission [PSMFC]), future potential for online reporting, and the development of the draft proposed rule implementing the Council’s preferred alternative to revise the EDR requirements.


Special Accommodations
These workshops are physically accessible to people with disabilities. Requests for special accommodations should be directed to Brian Garber-Yonts (see FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT) at least 5 working days before the workshop date.

Dated: July 2, 2012.
Emily Menashes,
Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service.
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program have experienced several benefits including: (1) Effectively advancing prosecution of an application before issuance of an Office action; (2) enhanced interaction between the applicant and the examiner before issuance of an Office action; (3) resolving patentability issues one-on-one with the examiner at the beginning of the prosecution process, rather than after a first Office action; and (4) expedited allowance of an application, relative to standard examination, due to the program’s enhanced communication and shorter time periods for response.

Extension: The Office is extending the FAI Pilot Program until August 16, 2012, while it completes its evaluation of the program. During this time, the Office will be gathering and analyzing relevant information, including comments from external and internal participants in order to determine what, if any, adjustments should be made to the program and whether the program will become permanent or be further extended.

Request for Comments: The Office is seeking comments on the FAI Pilot Program. The Office is interested in receiving feedback as to whether the program is meeting the needs of its applicants, and whether any aspects of the program cause applicants to not participate. The following questions have been provided to help elicit the types of information the Office is interested in receiving. However, the list of questions below is not exhaustive and responses do not need to be limited to only information that answers these questions.

1. Based on your use of the program, did you experience the benefits of the FAI program set out above? Did you experience additional benefits?
2. Did the Pre-Interview Communication provide you with sufficient, meaningful information to conduct an effective interview?
3. How productive is the interview before first action in advancing prosecution?
4. How would you rate the extent/utility of the information provided in the Pre-Interview Communication and subsequent Office action?
5. What changes would you make to the FAI program? How would these changes improve the program?
6. For any application in which you decided that the FAI program would not meet your needs, what aspect of the program made the program unsuitable for the application?
7. Do you consider the FAI program to be more efficient (or otherwise beneficial) as compared to traditional prosecution?

(8) Should the Office make the FAI program permanent?

Dated: June 29, 2012.

David J. Kappos,
Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

BILLING CODE 3510–16–P

COMMUNITY FOR PURCHASE FROM PEOPLE WHO ARE BLIND OR SEVERELY DISABLED

Procurement List; Additions

AGENCY: Committee for Purchase From People Who Are Blind or Severely Disabled.

ACTION: Additions to the Procurement List.

SUMMARY: This action adds products and services to the Procurement List that will be furnished by nonprofit agencies employing persons who are blind or have other severe disabilities.

DATES: Effective Date: 8/9/2012.


FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Barry S. Lineback, Telephone: (703) 603–7740, Fax: (703) 603–0655, or email CMTEFedReg@AbilityOne.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Additions

On 5/4/2012 (77 FR 26520–26521) and 5/11/2012 (77 FR 27737–27738), the Committee for Purchase From People Who Are Blind or Severely Disabled published notices of proposed additions to the Procurement List.

After consideration of the material presented to it concerning capability of qualified nonprofit agencies to provide the products and services and impact of the additions on the current or most recent contractors, the Committee has determined that products and services listed below are suitable for use by the Federal Government under 10 U.S.C. 8501–8506 and 41 CFR 51–2.4.

Regulatory Flexibility Act Certification

I certify that the following action will not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities. The major factors considered for this certification were:

1. The action will not result in any additional reporting, recordkeeping or other compliance requirements for small entities other than the small organizations that will furnish the products and services to the Government.
2. The action will result in authorizing small entities to furnish the products and services to the Government.
3. There are no known regulatory alternatives which would accomplish the objectives of the Javits-Wagner-O’Day Act (41 U.S.C. 8501–8506) in connection with the products and services proposed for addition to the Procurement List.

End of Certification

Accordingly, the following products and services are added to the Procurement List:

Products

Steel Roller Mop and Refill

NSN: 7920–01–383–7927—Refill, Sponge Head

NSN: 7920–01–383–7999—Roller Mop, Industrial Steel, 12’’ Head

NPA: Industries for the Blind, Inc., West Allis, WI

Contracting Activity: GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION, FORT WORTH, TX

Coverage: B–List for the Broad Government Requirement as aggregated by the General Services Administration.

Nuts, Flexible Packaging

NSN: 8925–01–E62–1745—Almonds, Shelled, Sliced, Natural (2lb bag)

NSN: 8925–01–E62–1746—Almonds, Shelled, Sliced, Blanched (2lb bag)

NSN: 8925–01–E62–1747—Almonds, Shelled, Sliced, Blanched (2lb bag)


NPA: DePaul Industries, Portland, OR

Contracting Activity: Defense Logistics Agency Troop Support, Philadelphia, PA

Coverage: C–List for 100% of the requirement of the Department of Defense, as aggregated by the Defense Logistics Agency Troop Support, Philadelphia, PA.

A comment was received from a contractor inferring that his company currently furnishes products to the Government that are the same or similar to the products specified in this proposal and the addition of the product to the Procurement List will adversely affect their business.

The Committee for Purchase From People Who Are Blind or Severely Disabled (Committee) operates pursuant to statutory and regulatory requirements. Committee regulations state that a commodity is not suitable for the Procurement List if there is “severe adverse impact on the current contractor for the specific commodity or service.”