

of the information to be collected; (d) 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; and (e) estimates of capital or start-up costs and costs of operation, maintenance, and purchase of services to provide information. Burden means the total time, effort, or financial resources expended by persons to generate, maintain, retain, disclose or provide information to or for a Federal agency. This includes the time needed to review instructions; to develop, acquire, install and utilize technology and systems for the purpose of collecting, validating and verifying information, processing and maintaining information, and disclosing and providing information; to train personnel and to be able to respond to a collection of information, to search data sources, to complete and review the collection of information; and to transmit or otherwise disclose the information.

All written comments will be available for public inspection on Regulations.gov.

An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid Office of Management and Budget control number.

Debra J. Bond,
Deputy Controller.

PARTNERSHIP FUND FOR PROGRAM INTEGRITY INNOVATION TEMPLATE INSTRUCTIONS FOR PILOT IDEA SUMMARY

The first step in the Partnership Fund pilot selection process is the submission of a pilot idea summary. Pilot idea summaries may be submitted by anyone through the partner4solutions.gov Web site, www.partner4solutions.gov, or the partner4solutions@omb.eop.gov email address. Pilot ideas may be sent to an independent Collaborative Forum for further development into more detailed concept papers. OMB consults with the Federal Steering Committee in selecting pilot concepts and making funding decisions.

Below are instructions for completing a pilot idea summary. Completed pilot idea summaries should not be more than two pages in length.

PARTNERSHIP FUND FOR PROGRAM INTEGRITY INNOVATION PILOT IDEA: Name of Pilot Idea

1. Pilot Idea: Summarize the idea in 2–3 sentences.

2. Programs Affected:

• Which programs are affected, either directly or indirectly? Ideally, an idea would address multiple programs and bridge multiple programmatic silos.

• Are these federal, state, and/or local programs? An ideal submission would involve multiple states and/or communities in the development or eventual implementation of a pilot.

3. Measurable Impacts: How does the pilot impact each of the four goals of the Partnership Fund? A pilot should address as many of these goals as possible across multiple programs or test a solution that could later be applied to multiple programs.

a) Improving payment accuracy
b) Improving administrative efficiency

c) Improving service delivery
d) Reducing access barriers for eligible beneficiaries

4. Expected Outcomes and Measurement Methodologies:

• What are the expectations and measures of success in relation to the four goals?

• What are the possible quantitative and qualitative measures?

• Could these outcomes be extrapolated to a larger environment?

5. Potential Partners or Sponsors:

• Which stakeholders and/or key organizations are involved?
• Does the proposed pilot have sufficient stakeholder buy-in? Stakeholders could include federal, state, and local governments, and non-governmental organizations.

6. Estimated Operating Cost of Pilot:

• How much would the pilot cost to implement?

• Are there resources of matching or leveraged funds that could be used to support this pilot?

• Is the Partnership Fund the most appropriate funding source for the pilot? All pilot ideas will be considered, but the Partnership Fund is targeting ideas that attempt to cut across multiple programs with multiple objectives, but have struggled to gain footing in existing program silos.

7. Estimated Impact on Program Costs:

• What are the anticipated costs and/or savings for the various programs involved in the pilot?

• If the pilot were to be scaled up, what are the anticipated costs/savings? Pilot ideas that increase program costs will be considered, but the Partnership Fund must comply with our statutory requirement to maintain overall cost neutrality.

8. Pilot Implementation Issues:

• Is this pilot idea ready for immediate implementation, or does it require further refinement?

• What is the timeframe in which the pilot would be conducted? The target time period for conducting the first round of pilots is 9–18 months.

• What are possible implementation barriers (e.g., privacy issues)?

• Is this pilot scalable? Successful ideas will demonstrate strong external validity and scalability.

• Could this pilot be implemented under existing legislative authorities or mechanisms?

• Are any administrative waivers required?

PARTNERSHIP FUND FOR PROGRAM INTEGRITY INNOVATION

PILOT IDEA SUMMARY: Name of Pilot Idea

1. Pilot Idea:
2. Programs Affected:
3. Measurable Impacts:
a) Improving payment accuracy
b) Improving administrative efficiency
c) Improving service delivery
d) Reducing access barriers for beneficiaries

4. Expected Outcomes and Measurement Methodologies:

5. Potential Partners or Sponsors:

6. Estimated Operating Cost of Pilot:

7. Estimated Impact on Program Costs:

8. Pilot Implementation Issues:

[FR Doc. 2011–13892 Filed 6–3–11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3110–01–P

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

Audits of States, Local Governments, and Non-Profit Organizations; OMB Circular A–133 Compliance Supplement

AGENCY: Executive Office of the President, Office of Management and Budget.

ACTION: Notice of availability of the 2011 OMB Circular A–133 Compliance Supplement.

SUMMARY: This notice announces the availability of the 2011 OMB Circular A–133 Compliance Supplement (Supplement). The notice also offers interested parties an opportunity to comment on the 2011 Supplement. The 2011 Supplement adds nineteen new programs, including five programs added to existing clusters. It deletes two programs and has also been updated for program changes and technical corrections. The two deleted programs are Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) 84.037, Reading First State Grants, and CFDA 84.938,

Hurricane Education Recovery, which are no longer active (*i.e.*, no funds are being spent by recipients), and have been archived in the CFDA.

In total, the 2011 Supplement includes 248 individual programs. A list of changes to the 2011 Supplement can be found at Appendix V. It updates Appendix VII that provides an audit alert and compliance requirements regarding the grant programs funded under American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009. Due to its length, the 2011 Supplement is not included in this Notice. See **ADDRESSES** for information about how to obtain a copy either on line or through the Government Printing Office.

DATES: The 2011 Supplement will apply to audits of fiscal years beginning after June 30, 2010 and supersedes the 2010 Supplement. All comments on the 2011 Supplement must be in writing and received by October 31, 2011. Late comments will be considered to the extent practicable. We received no comments on the 2010 Supplement.

Due to potential delays in OMB's receipt and processing of mail sent through the U.S. Postal Service, we encourage respondents to submit comments electronically to ensure timely receipt. We cannot guarantee that comments mailed will be received before the comment closing date.

Electronic mail comments may be submitted to:

Hai M. Tran@omb.eop.gov. Please include "A-133 Compliance Supplement—2011" in the subject line and the full body of your comments in the text of the electronic message and as an attachment. Please include your name, title, organization, postal address, telephone number, and e-mail address in the text of the message. Comments may also be submitted via facsimile at 202-395-3952.

Comments may be mailed to Gilbert Tran, Office of Federal Financial Management, Office of Management and Budget, 725 17th Street, NW., Room 6025, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20503.

Comments may also be sent to via <http://www.regulations.gov>—a Federal E-Government Web site that allows the public to find, review, and submit comments on documents that agencies have published in the **Federal Register** and that are open for comment. Simply type "A-133 Compliance Supplement—2011" (in quotes) in the Comment or Submission search box, click Go, and follow the instructions for submitting comments. Comments received by the date specified above will be included as part of the official record.

ADDRESSES: The 2011 Supplement is available on-line under the Management heading from the OMB home page (Management/Grants Management/Circulars subpage) on the Internet at <http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb>. Hard copies of the 2011 Supplement may be purchased at any Government Printing Office (GPO) bookstore (stock number: 041-001-00687-7). The main GPO bookstore is located at 710 North Capitol Street, NW., Washington, DC 20401, (202) 512-0132.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Recipients should contact their cognizant or oversight agency for audit, or Federal awarding agency, as appropriate under the circumstances. The Federal agency contacts are listed in Appendix III of the Supplement. Subrecipients should contact their pass-through entity. Federal agencies should contact Gilbert Tran, Office of Management and Budget, Office of Federal Financial Management, at (202) 395-3052.

Debra J. Bond,
Deputy Controller.

[FR Doc. 2011-13893 Filed 6-3-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Notice of Intent To Seek Approval To Establish an Information Collection

AGENCY: National Science Foundation.
ACTION: Notice and Request for Comments.

SUMMARY: In compliance with the requirement of Section 3506(c)(2)(A) of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 for opportunity for public comment on proposed data collection projects, the National Science Foundation (NSF) will publish periodic summaries of proposed projects.

DATES: Written comments on this notice must be received by August 5, 2011 to be assured of consideration. Comments received after that date will be considered to the extent practicable.

FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION OR

COMMENTS: Contact Suzanne Plimpton, Acting Reports Clearance Officer, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 295, Arlington, Virginia 22230; telephone 703-292-7556; or send e-mail to splimpto@nsf.gov. Individuals who use telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1-800-877-8339 between 8 a.m. to 8 p.m., Eastern Time, Monday through Friday. You also may obtain a copy of the data collection

instrument and instructions from Suzanne Plimpton.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title of Collection: National Evaluation of the Alliances for Graduate Education and the Professoriate, program survey and interview and focus group protocols.

OMB Approval Number: 3145-New.

Expiration Date of Approval: Not applicable.

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

Proposed Project: The Division of Human Resource Development of the Education and Human Resources Directorate (EHR/HRD) of the National Science Foundation has requested information on the Alliances for Graduate Education and the Professoriate (AGEP) Program. Funded by NSF, the AGEP Program currently funds 17 alliances of postsecondary institutions to promote the participation of underrepresented minority students in PhD programs in the fields of science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM). The ultimate goal of the program is to increase the number of underrepresented minorities in these fields who enter the professoriate. NSF seeks information from participants—that is, staff, students and faculty—to determine what influence the program has had on minority graduate students' decisions to enroll in and graduate from STEM doctoral programs and enter the professoriate. NSF proposes a longitudinal approach to the evaluation that includes analysis of extant data sources (*e.g.*, Survey of Earned Doctorates), virtual site visits with AGEP institutions, and a program survey. The virtual site visits will include up to 30 PhD granting universities (up to 10 each year in 2011, 2012, and 2013). These site visits include interviews with program staff and focus groups with students and faculty via videoconferencing or phone. The program survey will be completed once by each AGEP-funded institution.

Estimate of Burden for Virtual Site Visits: The Foundation estimates that, on average, 90 minutes will be required to conduct each program staff interview (2 per institution) and 60 minutes will be required for each faculty or student focus group (6 participants per group per institution). The Foundation estimates a total of up to 90 (1.5 hr × 2 × 30) hours to complete all program staff interviews and up to 360 (1hr × 12 × 30) hours to complete all faculty and student focus groups bringing the total burden hours to 450 for all respondents. Visited institutions will be selected