

and the Deputy Assistant Directors of the Office of Enforcement;

2. The Bureau's processes for the issuance of CIDs, including the non-delegable authority of the Director, Assistant Director of the Office of Enforcement, and the Deputy Assistant Directors of the Office of Enforcement to issue CIDs;

3. Specific steps that the Bureau could take to improve CID recipients' understanding of investigations, whether through the notification of purpose included in each CID or through other avenues, including facilitating a better understanding of the specific types of information sought by the CID;

4. The nature and scope of requests included in Bureau CIDs, including whether topics, questions, or requests for written reports effectively achieve the Bureau's statutory and regulatory objectives, while minimizing burdens, consistent with applicable law, and the extent to which the meet and confer process helps achieve these objectives;

5. The timeframes associated with each step of the Bureau's CID process, including return dates, and the specific timeframes for meeting and conferring, and petitioning to modify or set aside a CID;

6. The Bureau's taking of testimony from an entity, including whether 12 CFR 1080.6(a)(4)(ii), and/or the Bureau's processes should be modified to make expressly clear that the standards applicable to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 30(b)(6) also apply to the Bureau's taking of testimony from an entity;

7. The Bureau's processes for handling the inadvertent production of privileged information, including whether 12 CFR 1080.8(c) and/or the Bureau's processes should be modified in order to make expressly clear that the standards applicable to Federal Rule of Evidence 502 also apply to documents inadvertently produced in response to a CID;

8. The rights afforded to witnesses by 12 CFR 1080.9, including limitations on the role of counsel described in 12 CFR 1080.9(b) in light of the statutory delineation of objections set forth in 12 U.S.C. 5562(c)(13)(D)(iii);

9. The Bureau's processes concerning meeting and conferring with recipients of CIDs, including, for example, negotiations regarding modifications and the delegation of authority to the Assistant Director of the Office of Enforcement and Deputy Assistant Directors of the Office of Enforcement to negotiate and approve the terms of satisfactory compliance with civil

investigative demands and extending the time for compliance;

10. The Bureau's requirements for responding to CIDs, including certification requirements, and the Bureau's CID document submission standards; and

11. The Bureau's processes concerning CID recipients' petitions to modify or set aside Bureau CIDs, including:

a. Whether it is appropriate for Bureau investigators to provide the Director with a statement setting out a response to the petition without serving that response on the petitioner;

b. Whether petitions and the Director's orders should be made public, consistent with applicable laws; and

c. The costs and benefits of the petition to modify or set aside process, vis-à-vis direct adjudication in Federal court, in light of the statutory requirement for the petition process and the fact that CIDs are not self-enforcing.

Authority: 12 U.S.C. 5511(c).

Dated: January 18, 2018.

Mick Mulvaney,

Acting Director, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection.

[FR Doc. 2018-01435 Filed 1-25-18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4810-AM-P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Air Force

Acceptance of Group Application Under Public Law and Department of Defense Directive

AGENCY: Department of the Air Force, DoD Civilian/Military Service Review Board, DoD.

ACTION: Notice.

Under the provisions of Section 401, Public Law 95-202 and DoD Directive 100.20, the Department of Defense Civilian/Military Service Review Board has accepted an application on behalf of a group known as "Department of the Navy (DON) Civilian Special Agents who Served in Direct Support and Under Control of the DON within the Republic of Vietnam During the Period January 9, 1962 through May 7, 1975 (Vietnam War)." Persons with information or documentation pertinent to the determination of whether service of this group should be considered active military service to the Armed Forces of the United States are encouraged to submit such information or documentation within 60 days to the DoD Civilian/Military Service Review Board (DoD C/MSRB), 1500 West

Perimeter Road, Suite 3700, Joint Base Andrews NAF, MD 20762-7002.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Thomas R. Uiselt, Deputy Executive Secretary, DoD C/MSRB, at 240-612-5409, thomas.r.uiselt.civ@mail.mil. Copies of documents or other materials submitted cannot be returned.

Henry Williams,

Acting Air Force Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 2018-01308 Filed 1-25-18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5001-10-P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Defense Acquisition Regulations System

[Docket Number DARS-2016-0033; OMB Control Number 0704-0332]

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

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

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Defense Acquisition Regulations System has submitted to OMB for clearance, the following proposal for collection of information under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act.

DATES: Consideration will be given to all comments received by February 26, 2018.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title and OMB Number: Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (DFARS) Appendix I, DoD Pilot Mentor-Protege Program; OMB Control Number 0704-0332.

Affected Public: Businesses or other for-profit and not-for-profit institutions.

Respondent's Obligation: Required to obtain or retain benefits.

Type of Request: Revision of a currently approved collection.

Reporting Frequency: On occasion.

Number of Respondents: 127.

Responses per Respondent: 2, approximately.

Annual Responses: 255.

Average Burden per Response: 2.3 hours, approximately.

Annual Burden Hours: 595.

Needs and Uses: DoD needs this information to ensure that participants in the Mentor-Protege Program ("the Program") are fulfilling their obligations under the mentor-protege agreements and that the Government is receiving value for the benefits it provides through the Program. DoD uses the information as source data for reports to