

licensees to use spectrum on a non-interference basis to experiment with new technologies and innovations. Under the experimental licensing program, users may identify any spectrum of interest for experimentation and are generally authorized for up to two years with the possibility of renewal. Should users be authorized for use of the Test-Bed through use of the experimental licensing program? Alternatively, the Commission could conduct a rulemaking proceeding to specifically authorize various uses and frequency bands. We request that commenters provide details regarding which method is most advantageous for meeting the goal(s) of the program. In providing information regarding this question, commenters should keep in mind the following:

a. Experimental licensing rules and procedures are already contained in part 5 of the Commission's rules. Thus, these procedures could be used without further action by the Commission.

b. Experimental licensing is flexible (*i.e.*, under experimental licenses, licensees have no rights to use the spectrum exclusively, may not cause harmful interference to any user and are not protected from harmful interference caused by other spectrum users).

c. A rulemaking proceeding may need to specifically identify potential modifications to the table of spectrum allocations, usage restrictions, and licensee rights for both the Test-Bed user and any incumbent licensees. Commenters who advocate such an approach should provide details regarding spectrum bands, proposed usage, how users should be authorized for use of the Test-Bed (*e.g.*, obtain a license through one of the Commission's licensing systems), and user status (*i.e.*, primary, secondary, non-interference basis) and the relationship of the Test-Bed user to incumbents.

6. Options exist for implementation of the Test-Bed with respect to a specific geographic area. Commenters should provide details regarding the necessity for experimentation to occur over large or small areas. Similarly, commenters should provide details regarding whether experiments can be limited to rural areas or areas where there are relatively few incumbent users. One advantage to such an approach is that the risk of causing harmful interference to an incumbent user is reduced. We seek comment on whether such a restriction should exist and on other methods of ensuring that incumbent users are protected from interference.

7. What information should be provided to the Commission prior to initiating use of the Test-Bed? For

example, should the Commission require submission of pre-experiment assumptions, analysis (modeling and simulation), and pre-experiment predictions?

8. If there are competing proposals for use of the Test-Bed, what criteria should be used to select candidates? Should multiple candidates be selected? If so, what procedures are needed for these candidates to coordinate with each other?

9. Are special procedures necessary for non-federal users of the Test-Bed to coordinate usage with Federal users of the Test-Bed?

10. What other issues or factors should be considered with respect to creation of a Test-Bed?

11. Should Commission personnel (along with personnel whom NTIA may assign) be appointed as overseers to gauge the progress of the program? Is a more or less active role by the FCC desired?

12. What resources, if any, including equipment to be evaluated in the Test-Bed, funding, personnel, or facilities could parties provide for the Test-Bed program? Would use of private resources potentially create conflicts of interest among Test-Bed users?

13. To promote participation by interested parties, should the creation and use of any incentives be considered? What incentives, if any, could be considered and by whom should they be created and offered?

14. Should use of proprietary technologies or information be permitted in the Test-Bed? If so, how should release of data based on their use be handled?

#### *C. Conclusion and Evaluation of the Test-Bed Program*

15. What metrics should be used in evaluating the results/accomplishments of the Test-Bed program?

16. If the program meets the performance metrics, should it be expanded to other frequency bands, and/or other locations? Why or why not?

17. What expectations should be placed on equipment and techniques developed during the experiment(s)? For example, should there be an expectation that a successful experiment would translate into permanent usage or at the minimum a rulemaking proceeding by the Commission to explore rule changes consistent with the experiment results?

18. At the conclusion of any experiment, should users be required to submit a report detailing the experiment—goal, assumptions, methodology, and results?

Federal Communications Commission.

**Marlene H. Dortch,**

*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. E6-9497 Filed 6-20-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-P

---

## FEDERAL HOUSING FINANCE BOARD

[No. 2006-N-03]

### Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

**AGENCY:** Federal Housing Finance Board.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the requirements of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, the Federal Housing Finance Board (Finance Board) has submitted the information collection entitled "Federal Home Loan Bank Acquired Member Assets, Core Mission Activities, Investments and Advances" to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval of a 3 year extension of the OMB control number, which is due to expire on March 31, 2007.

Elsewhere in this issue of the **Federal Register**, the Finance Board is publishing a final rule that reorganizes the way it imposes certain reporting requirements on the Federal Home Loan Banks (Banks), including the reporting requirements in this information collection. The information collection has been moved from Finance Board regulations and into the Data Reporting Manual, which is an enforceable order issued pursuant to the Finance Board's investigatory powers.

**DATES:** Interested persons may submit comments on or before July 21, 2006.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit comments to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs of the Office of Management and Budget, Attention: Desk Officer for the Federal Housing Finance Board, Washington, DC 20503.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION OR COPIES OF THE INFORMATION COLLECTION CONTACT:** David Roderer, Office of Supervision, by e-mail at [rodererd@fhfb.gov](mailto:rodererd@fhfb.gov), by telephone at 202-408-2540, or by regular mail at the Federal Housing Finance Board, 1625 Eye Street, NW., Washington DC 20006.

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

##### **A. Need For and Use of the Information Collection**

The Finance Board has authorized the Banks to acquire mortgage loans and other assets from their members or housing associates under certain

circumstances. 12 CFR part 955. The regulation refers to these assets as acquired member assets or AMA. As part of this regulatory authorization, each Bank that acquires residential mortgage loans must provide to the Finance Board certain loan-level data on a quarterly basis. The Finance Board uses this data to monitor the safety and soundness of the Banks and the extent to which the Banks are fulfilling their statutory housing finance mission through their AMA programs. See 12 U.S.C. 1422a(a).

While the Banks provide the AMA data directly to the Finance Board, each Bank initially must collect the information from the private-sector member or housing associate from which the Bank acquires the mortgage loan. Bank members and housing associates already collect the vast majority of the data the Finance Board requires in order to do business with Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac under regulatory requirements issued by the Department of Housing and Urban Development and pursuant to the information collection requirements under the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act. Thus, the Finance Board's information collection imposes only a minor incremental additional burden on Bank members and housing associates.

Elsewhere in this issue of the **Federal Register**, the Finance Board is publishing a final rule that reorganizes the way it imposes certain reporting requirements on the Banks, including the reporting requirements in this information collection. More specifically, the final rule removes the reporting requirements from 12 CFR part 955 (specifically, § 955.4 and Appendices A and B). At the same time it adopted the final rule, the Board of Directors added the AMA reporting requirements to the Data Reporting Manual (DRM), where they will appear as Chapter Three.<sup>1</sup> The DRM is available electronically on the Finance Board Web site at: <http://www.fhfb.gov/Default.aspx?Page=101>.

The OMB control number for the information collection, which expires on March 31, 2007, is 3069-0058. The likely respondents are institutions that sell AMA assets to Banks.

### B. Burden Estimate

The Finance Board estimates the total annual average number of respondents at 600, with 4 responses per respondent. The estimate for the average hours per

response is 24 hours. The estimate for the total annual hour burden is 57,600 hours (600 respondents × 4 responses per respondent × 24 hours).

Bank members and housing associates could incur additional one-time costs to be able to collect and report the loan-level data elements needed to allow for better tracking and modeling of prepayment and default rates of mortgage portfolios. The Finance Board estimates this additional, one-time cost at \$120,000 (\$2,000 × 600 members/housing associates).

### C. Comment Request

In accordance with the requirements of 5 CFR 1320.8(d), the Finance Board published a request for public comments regarding proposed changes to the AMA database and the burden estimates for this information collection in the **Federal Register** on November 2, 2005. See 70 FR 66413 (Nov. 2, 2005). The 60-day comment period closed on January 3, 2006. The Finance Board did not receive any comments.

The Finance Board requests written comments on the following: (1) Whether the collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of Finance Board functions, including whether the information has practical utility; (2) the accuracy of the Finance Board's estimates of the burdens and costs of the collection of information; (3) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information collected; and (4) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology. Submit comments to OMB in writing at the address listed above.

Dated: June 14, 2006.

By the Federal Housing Finance Board.

**John P. Kennedy,**

*General Counsel.*

[FR Doc. E6-9755 Filed 6-20-06; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6725-01-P**

## FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

### Notice of Agreement Filed

The Commission hereby gives notice of the filing of the following agreement under the Shipping Act of 1984. Interested parties may submit comments on an agreement to the Secretary, Federal Maritime Commission, Washington, DC 20573, within ten days of the date this notice appears in the **Federal Register**. Copies of agreements are available through the Commission's

Office of Agreements (202-523-5793) or ([tradeanalysis@fmc.gov](mailto:tradeanalysis@fmc.gov)).

*Agreement No.:* 011947-001.

*Title:* Grimaldi/Sallaum Space Charter Agreement.

*Parties:* Grimaldi Compagnia di Navigazione and Sallaum Lines SAL.

*Filing Party:* Wayne R. Rohde, Esq.; Sher & Blackwell LLP; 1850 M Street, NW.; Suite 900; Washington, DC 20036.

*Synopsis:* The amendment extends the duration of the agreement to November 7, 2006.

Dated: June 16, 2006.

By Order of the Federal Maritime Commission.

**Karen V. Gregory,**

*Assistant Secretary.*

[FR Doc. E6-9743 Filed 6-20-06; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6730-01-P**

## FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

### Change in Bank Control Notices; Acquisition of Shares of Bank or Bank Holding Companies

The notificants listed below have applied under the Change in Bank Control Act (12 U.S.C. 1817(j)) and § 225.41 of the Board's Regulation Y (12 CFR 225.41) to acquire a bank or bank holding company. The factors that are considered in acting on the notices are set forth in paragraph 7 of the Act (12 U.S.C. 1817(j)(7)).

The notices are available for immediate inspection at the Federal Reserve Bank indicated. The notices also will be available for inspection at the office of the Board of Governors. Interested persons may express their views in writing to the Reserve Bank indicated for that notice or to the offices of the Board of Governors. Comments must be received not later than July 6, 2006.

**A. Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis** (Glenda Wilson, Community Affairs Officer) 411 Locust Street, St. Louis, Missouri 63166-2034:

1. *Leon Brasher*, Fredonia, Kentucky; to gain control of Fredonia Valley Bancorporation, Inc., Fredonia, Kentucky, and thereby indirectly gain control of Fredonia Valley Bank, Fredonia, Kentucky.

**B. Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City** (Donna J. Ward, Assistant Vice President) 925 Grand Avenue, Kansas City, Missouri 64198-0001:

1. *The Watts Revocable Declaration of Trust dtd 11/6/96 (Richard J. Watts, Trustee), RJW Enterprises, and Richard J. Watts*, all of Ramona, California, and Janice and Jack A. Reccoforte, El Cajon, California; acting as a group to retain

<sup>1</sup> See Resolution Number 2006-11 (June 14, 2006) (available electronically in the FOIA Reading Room of the Finance Board Web site at: <http://www.fhfb.gov/Default.aspx?Page=59&Top=4>).