A live Web cast of the Meeting can be viewed at www.cpsc.gov/live.

For a recorded message containing the latest agenda information, call (301) 504–7948.

CONTACT PERSON FOR MORE INFORMATION:
Todd A. Stevenson, Office of the Secretary, U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission, 4330 East West Highway, Bethesda, MD 20814, (301) 504–7923.

Dated: November 12, 2013.
Todd A. Stevenson, Secretary.
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DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
Office of the Secretary

[DOCKET ID: DoD–2013–OS–0208]

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of Defense has submitted to OMB for clearance, the following proposal for collection of information under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35).

DATES: Consideration will be given to all comments received by December 16, 2013.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Fred Licari, 571–372–0493.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Title, Associated Form and OMB Number: Information Assurance Scholarship Program; OMB Control Number 0704–TBD.

Type of Request: New.
Number of Respondents: 493.
Responses per Respondent: 1.
Annual Responses: 493.
Average Burden per Response: 15 minutes.
Annual Burden Hours: 123.5 hours.
Needs and Uses: The National Security Agency (NSA) is the Executive Administrator of the DoD Information Assurance Scholarship Program (IASP), serving on behalf of DoD Chief Information Officer. Those who wish to participate in the DoD IASP Recruitment program must complete and submit an application package through their college or university to NSA. Centers of Academic Excellence in Information Assurance and Research (CAEs) interested in applying for capacity-building grants must complete and submit a written proposal, and all colleges and universities subsequently receiving grants must provide documentation on how the grant funding was utilized and the resulting accomplishments. Without this written documentation, the DoD has no means of judging the quality of applicants to the program or collecting information regarding program performance. In addition, the DoD IASP participants and their faculty advisors (Principal Investigators) are asked to complete annual program assessment surveys. These surveys are collectively reviewed to assess the program’s effectiveness from the perspective of the students and Principal Investigators. The survey information is used to improve the program in subsequent years.

Affected Public: Individuals or households, specifically college students at institutions designated as CAEs who are interested in, and qualify to apply for a scholarship; CAEs interested in submitting proposals for capacity-building grants, and faculty advisors (Principal Investigators).

Frequency: On occasion.

Respondent’s Obligation: Voluntary.

OMB Desk Officer: Ms. Jasmeet Seehra.

Written comments and recommendations on the proposed information collection should be sent to Ms. Jasmeet Seehra at the Office of Management and Budget, Desk Officer for DoD, Room 10236, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20503. You may also submit comments, identified by docket number and title, by the following method:


Instructions: All submissions received must include the agency name, docket number and title for this Federal Register document. The general policy for comments and other submissions from members of the public is to make these submissions available for public viewing on the Internet at http://www.regulations.gov as they are received without change, including any personal identifiers or contact information.

DoD Clearance Officer: Ms. Patricia Toppings.

Written requests for copies of the information collection proposal should be sent to Ms. Toppings at WHS/ESD Information Management Division, 4800 Mark Center Drive, East Tower, Suite 02G09, Alexandria, VA 22350–3100.

Dated: November 8, 2013.

Aaron Siegel.

Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.

[FR Doc. 2013–27250 Filed 11–13–13; 8:45 am]
Surveillance and reconnaissance, Remotely Piloted Aircraft, Space, Cyber, Special Operations, and Building Partnership Capacity. Commissioners will also explore the implications of rising demands and expectations for the “Home Game” in missions such as Homeland Defense, Homeland Security, and Defense Support to Civil Agencies. This will include implications for the structure of the Air Force from the growing threat of the “Away Game” involving simultaneous attacks on the Homeland. The third area of discussion will be on the continuing growth of demand on traditional Air Force core functions including: Air Superiority, Air Mobility, Global Precision Attack, Nuclear Deterrence Operations, Command and Control, Personnel Recovery, Agile Combat Support, Training and Education, and other specific mission sets such as security forces, civil engineering and science and technology.

—Projections and assumptions about future resource levels that will be available to organize, train and equip the Air Force. This will include assumptions about how the Budget Control Act and Sequestration legislation will affect Total Obligational Authority and associated planning, programming and budgeting flexibility. Commissioners will also consider the impact of strategic choices on Air Force capabilities and force structure options derived from the selection of national priorities among modernization, technology recapitalization, readiness, capacity and force structure. In this discussion Commissioners will consider the various approaches to how to calculate and apply cost methods and data to questions of force structure.

—The root causes of legislative and bureaucratic development of the force structure issues that led to the creation of the Commission in 2013. They will consider how these issues are rooted in the American militia heritage and the history of the Air Force since 1947. This discussion will extend to accounting for the socio-cultural dimensions of force structure issues ranging from the fundamental relationship of the American people to their military and to sub-cultures within the Air Force.

—How to institutionalize the shift in the fundamental role of the reserve components from a strategic reserve to an operational reserve with associated expectations. Commissioners will also consider the force mix options they are prepared to assess in terms of relative weight of force structure in each of the components. Commissioners will consider whether to recommend that the Department of Defense invert the force sizing planning paradigm from sizing to meet the expected wartime surge to an approach that begins with the Steady State Requirement then resource the components to provide the nation with a meaningful surge capacity for the strategy. They will also address considerations for measuring and assessing Active, Reserve and Guard Effectiveness—both cost and mission effectiveness.

—Alternative approaches to how the nation should direct, control and guide the active, reserve and National Guard Air Forces, including:

- Whether, and if so how, to simplify Title 10, Title 32 and other governing legislative authorities;
- How to re-balance the current mix of Active, Reserve and Guard components into and across any and all mission functions;
- Whether, and if so how, to reorganize the Air Force Active, Reserve and National Guard into less than 3 components;
- Can the Air Force move to a periodic readiness schedule without creating a “hollow force;”
- Does component “ownership” of aircraft matter anymore and how can the Associate Unit paradigm be adapted to the future;
- Approaching future force integration of new systems capabilities by means of a Concurrent Proportional resourcing method across the components to replace today’s priority of equipping the Active Component first;
- Accelerating the adoption of a “Continuum of Service” model to facilitate the ability of Airmen to move from any component into another at multiple points in their career path without prejudice;
- Enhancing the total force through equalized opportunities across the components for professional and technical education and shared experiences;
- Recognizing in promotion and selection processes differing but equivalent ends, ways, and means of professional development.

Fundamental shift in policy goals for “Deploy-to-Dwell,” “Mobilization-to-Dwell,” and associated metrics for the post-Afghanistan period, as well as how deployment credit will be accounted.

Reconsider the nation’s needs for Overseas Basing and the capacity of continental United States’ infrastructure afforded by investments in Reserve and Guard basing capacities available to the Total Force.

Meeting Accessibility: In accordance with section 10(d) of the FACA, 5 U.S.C. 552b, and 41 CFR 1102–3.155, the DoD has determined that the meeting scheduled for November 12, 2013 was closed to the public in its entirety. Specifically, the Director of Administration and Management, with the coordination of the DoD FACA Attorney, has determined in writing that this meeting was closed to the public because it discussed classified information and matters covered by 5 U.S.C. 552b(c)(1).

Written Comments: Pursuant to 41 CFR 102–3.105(j) and 102–3.140 and section 10(a)(3) of the FACA, the public or interested organizations may submit written comments to the Commission in response to the stated agenda of the open and/or closed meeting or the Commission’s mission. The Designated Federal Officer (DFO) will review all submitted written statements before forwarding to the Commission. Written comments should be submitted to Mrs. Marcia Moore, DFO, via facsimile or electronic mail, the preferred modes of submission. Each page of the comment must include the author’s name, title or affiliation, address, and daytime phone number. All contact information may be found in the FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT section. While written comments are forwarded to the Commissioners upon receipt, note that all written comments on the Commission’s charge, as described in the ‘Background’ section, must be received by November 29, 2013, via email or fax, to be considered by the Commissioners for the final report. The postmark date was November 8, 2013. Due to difficulties finalizing the meeting agenda for the scheduled meeting of the National Commission on the Structure of the Air Force for November 12, 2013, the requirements of 41 CFR 102–3.150(a) were not met. Accordingly, the Advisory Committee Management Officer for the Department of Defense, pursuant to 41 CFR 102–3.150(b), waived the 15-calendar day notification requirement.

Background

The National Commission on the Structure of the Air Force was established by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Pub. L. 112–239). The Department of Defense sponsor for the Commission is the Director of Administration and Management, Mr. Michael L. Rhodes. The Commission is tasked to submit a report, containing a comprehensive study and recommendations, by February 1, 2014 to the President of the United States and the Congressional
defence committees. The report will contain a detailed statement of the findings and conclusions of the Commission, together with its recommendations for such legislation and administrative actions it may consider appropriate in light of the results of the study. The comprehensive study of the structure of the U.S. Air Force will determine whether, and how, the structure should be modified to best fulfill current and anticipated mission requirements for the U.S. Air Force in a manner consistent with available resources.

The evaluation factors under consideration by the Commission are for a U.S. Air Force structure that—(a) meets current and anticipated requirements of the combatant commands; (b) achieves an appropriate balance between the regular and reserve components of the Air Force, taking advantage of the unique strengths and capabilities of each; (c) ensures that the regular and reserve components of the Air Force have the capacity needed to support current and anticipated homeland defense and disaster assistance missions in the United States; (d) provides for sufficient numbers of regular members of the Air Force to provide a base of trained personnel from which the personnel of the reserve components of the Air Force could be recruited; (e) maintains a peacetime rotation force to support operational tempo goals of 1:2 for regular members of the Air Forces and 1:5 for members of the reserve components of the Air Force; and (f) maximizes and appropriately balances affordability, efficiency, effectiveness, capability, and readiness.

Dated: November 8, 2013.

Aaron Siegel,
Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.
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BILLING CODE 5001–06–P

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
[Docket No.: ED–2013–ICCD–0113]

Agency Information Collection Activities; Submission to the Office of Management and Budget for Review and Approval; Comment Request; Student Assistance General Provisions—Satisfactory Academic Progress Policy

AGENCY: Federal Student Aid (FSA), Department of Education (ED).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. chapter 3501 et seq.), ED is proposing an extension of an existing information collection.

DATES: Interested persons are invited to submit comments on or before December 16, 2013.

ADDRESS: Comments submitted in response to this notice should be submitted electronically through the Federal eRulemaking Portal at http://www.regulations.gov by selecting Docket ID number ED–2013–ICCD–0113 or via postal mail, commercial delivery, or hand delivery. Please note that comments submitted by fax or email and those submitted after the comment period will not be accepted. Written requests for information or comments submitted by postal mail or delivery should be addressed to the Director of the Information Collection Clearance Division, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue SW., LBJ, Room 2E103, Washington, DC 20202–4537.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For questions related to collection activities or burden, please call Kate Mullan, 202–401–0563 or electronically mail ICDocketMgr@ed.gov. Please do not send comments here.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Department of Education (ED), in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA) (44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A)), provides the general public and Federal agencies with an opportunity to comment on proposed, revised, and continuing collections of information. This helps the Department assess the impact of its information collection requirements and minimize the public’s reporting burden. It also helps the public understand the Department’s information collection requirements and provide the requested data in the desired format. ED is soliciting comments on the proposed information collection request (ICR) that is described below. The Department of Education is especially interested in public comment addressing the following issues: (1) Is this collection necessary to the proper functions of the Department; (2) will this information be processed and used in a timely manner; (3) is the estimate of burden accurate; (4) how might the Department enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (5) how might the Department minimize the burden of this collection on the respondents, including through the use of information technology. Please note that written received in response to this notice will be considered public records.

Title of Collection: Student Assistance General Provisions—Subpart K—Verification Student Aid Application Information.

OMB Control Number: 1845–0108.

Type of Review: Extension without change of an existing collection of information.

Respondents/Affected Public: Private sector, State, Local, or Tribal Governments, individuals or households.

Total Estimated Number of Annual Responses: 37,160,441.

Total Estimated Number of Annual Burden Hours: 1,627,616.

Abstract: This request is for an extension of the current approval of the policies and procedures for determining satisfactory academic progress (SAP) as required in Section 484 of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended (HEA). These regulations identify the policies and procedures to ensure that students are making satisfactory academic progress in their program at a pace and a level to receive or continue to receive Title IV, HEA program funds. If there is lapse in progress, the policy must identify how the student will be notified and what steps are available to a student not making satisfactory academic progress toward the completion of their program, and under what conditions a student who is not making satisfactory academic progress may continue to receive Title IV, HEA program funds.

Dated: November 8, 2013.

Kate Mullan,
Acting Director, Information Collection Clearance Division, Privacy, Information and Records Management Services, Office of Management.
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BILLING CODE 4000–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
[Docket No.: ED–2013–ICCD–0118]

Agency Information Collection Activities; Submission to the Office of Management and Budget for Review and Approval; Comment Request; Application for Approval To Participate in Federal Student Financial Aid Programs

AGENCY: Federal Student Aid (FSA), Department of Education (ED).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. chapter 3501 et seq.), ED is proposing an extension of an existing information collection.