Among the topics of interest, OMB invites feedback on the following queries:

- Prior to the initiation of an adjudication, what would ensure a speedy and/or fair investigation? What reform(s) would avoid a prolonged investigation? Should investigated parties have an opportunity to require an agency to “show cause” to continue an investigation?
- When do multiple agencies investigate the same (or related) conduct and then force Americans to contest liability in different proceedings across multiple agencies? What reforms would encourage agencies to adjudicate related conduct in a single proceeding before a single adjudicator?
- Would applying the principle of res judicata in the regulatory context reduce duplicative proceedings? How would agencies effectively apply res judicata?
- In the regulatory/civil context, when does an American have to prove an absence of legal liability? Put differently, need an American prove innocence in regulatory proceeding(s)? What reform(s) would ensure an American never has to prove the absence of liability? To what extent permissible, should the Administration address burdens of persuasion and/or production in regulatory proceedings? Or should the scope of this reform focus strictly on an initial presumption of innocence?
- What evidentiary rules apply in regulatory proceedings to guard against hearsay and/or weigh reliability and relevance? Would the application of some of the Federal Rules of Evidence create a fairer evidentiary framework, and if so, which Rules?
- Should agencies be required to produce all evidence favorable to the respondent? What rules and/or procedures would ensure the expedient production of all exculpatory evidence?
- Do adjudicators sometimes lack independence from the enforcement arm of the agency? What reform(s) would adequately separate functions and guarantee an adjudicator's independence?
- Do agencies provide enough transparency regarding penalties and fines? Are penalties generally fair and proportionate to the infractions for which they are assessed? What reform(s) would ensure consistency and transparency regarding regulatory penalties for a particular agency or the federal government as a whole?
- When do regulatory investigations and/or adjudications coerce Americans into resolutions/settlements? What safeguards would systemically prevent unfair and/or coercive resolutions?

- Are agencies and agency staff accountable to the public in the context of enforcement and adjudications? If not, how can agencies create greater accountability?
- Are there certain types of proceedings that, due to exigency or other causes, warrant fewer procedural protections than others?

For each of the above queries, OMB requests specific, concrete examples of current due process shortfalls and concrete reform proposals to ensure adequate due process. Abstract, general principles will do little to advance actionable reform.

Instructions for Written Responses

Interested parties should provide written responses to the questions outlined in the supplementary information section of this Federal Register document. Submissions are due 45 days from publication of this document through www.regulations.gov and should be identified by docket number OMB–2019–0006. Please include the below in your response, limiting this portion of your response to one page:

- The name of the individual(s) and/or organization responding. Anonymous responses will also be accepted.
- A brief description of the responding individual(s) or organization’s mission and/or areas of expertise, if the responder feels appropriate.
- A contact for questions or other follow-up on your response if desired.

Comments submitted in response to this document are subject to FOIA. OMB may also make all comments available to the public. For this reason, please do not include in your comments information of a confidential nature, such as sensitive personal information or proprietary information. If you send an email comment, your email address will be automatically captured and included as part of the comment that is placed in the public docket and made available on the internet. Please note that responses to this public comment request containing any routine notice about the confidentiality of the communication will be treated as public comments that may be made available to the public notwithstanding the inclusion of the routine notice.

Russell T. Vought,
Acting Director, OMB.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

[Notice (20-006)]

Notice of Intent To Grant Partially Exclusive License

AGENCY: National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

ACTION: Notice of intent to grant partially exclusive patent license.

products and/or similar field(s) of use thereto. NASA has not yet made a determination to grant the requested license and may deny the requested license even if no objections are submitted within the comment period.

DATES: The prospectively partially exclusive license may be granted unless NASA receives written objections including evidence and argument, no later than February 14, 2020 that would not be consistent with the requirements regarding the licensing of federally owned inventions as set forth in the Bayh-Dole Act and implementing regulations. Competing applications completed and received by NASA no later than February 14, 2020 will also be treated as objections to the grant of the contemplated [partially] exclusive license. Objections submitted in response to this notice will not be made available to the public for inspection and, to the extent permitted by law, will not be released under the Freedom of Information Act.

ADDRESSES: Objections relating to the prospective license may be submitted to Patent Counsel, Office of Chief Counsel, NASA Langley Research Center, MS 30, Hampton, Virginia 23681. Phone (757) 864–3221. Facsimile (757) 864–9190.


SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This notice of intent to grant a partially exclusive patent license is issued in accordance with 35 U.S.C. 209(a) and 37 CFR 404.7(a)(1)(i). The patent rights in these inventions have been assigned to the United States of America as represented by the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The prospective partially exclusive license will comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 209 and 37 CFR 404.7.

Information about other NASA inventions available for licensing can be found online at http://technology.nasa.gov.

William McMurry, Deputy General Counsel.

[FR Doc. 2020–01712 Filed 1–29–20; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7510–13–P

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION
Agency Information Collection Activities: Comment Request

AGENCY: National Science Foundation.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The National Science Foundation (NSF) is announcing plans to establish this collection. In accordance with the requirements of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, we are providing opportunity for public comment on this action. After obtaining and considering public comment, NSF will prepare the submission requesting OMB clearance of this collection for no longer than 3 years.

DATES: Written comments on this notice must be received by March 2, 2020 to be assured consideration. Comments received after that date will be considered to the extent practicable. Send comments to address below.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Suzanne H. Plimpton, Reports Clearance Officer, National Science Foundation, 2415 Eisenhower Avenue, Suite W18200, Alexandria, Virginia 22314; telephone (703) 292–7556; or send email to splimpto@nsf.gov. Individuals who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1–800–877–8339, which is accessible 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 365 days a year (including Federal holidays).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title of Collection: Evaluation of the Sustainability and Diffusion of the NSF ADVANCE Program.

OMB Number: 3145–NEW.

Expiration Date of Approval: Not applicable.

Type of Request: Intent to seek approval to establish an information collection.

Proposed Project: Use of the Information: The ADVANCE Program, launched by the National Science Foundation in 2001, supports projects to identify and address structural and policy barriers to equity for STEM faculty. The proposed evaluation examines the sustainability and diffusion of ADVANCE strategies. The evaluation focuses on ADVANCE projects that began in 2001 and 2018, as well as proposals for the ADVANCE Institutional Transformation (IT) grants that were not funded. The data collection for this request includes: Six self-completion online surveys (with questions tailored to different types of ADVANCE grants); one self-completion online survey for ADVANCE Institutional Transformation applicants; and one instrument to conduct interviews with two representatives from six ADVANCE grantees.

Respondents: Respondents are representatives from ADVANCE grantees and applicants of ADVANCE Institutional Transformation grants.

Estimated Number of Annual Respondents: 328 individuals.

Burdens on the Public: 227 hours.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data collection type</th>
<th>Number of individuals</th>
<th>Participation time (in minutes)</th>
<th>Burden (in annual hours)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Institution Organizational Change Ongoing Survey</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Ended Survey</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership Ended Survey</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership Ongoing Survey</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Institution Organizational Change Ended Survey and Leadership Ended Survey</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Institution Self-Assessment Ended Survey</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Institution Organizational Change Ongoing Survey and Single Institution Self-Assessment Ended Survey</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Transformation Applicant Survey</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone interviews with representatives of ADVANCE Grantees</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>328</td>
<td></td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>