

request was rejected starting no later than nine (9) months after date of contract award.

**C.5.3 External Auditor**—The Contractor shall have an external, independent, specialized compliance auditor conduct an audit of the IANA functions security provisions annually.

### C.6 Performance Exclusions

**C.6.1** This purchase order, in itself, does not authorize modifications, additions, or deletions to the root zone file or associated information. (This purchase order does not alter the root zone file responsibilities as set forth in Amendment 11 of the Cooperative Agreement NCR-9218742 between the DoC and VeriSign, Inc.)

**C.6.2** This purchase order, in itself, does not authorize the Contractor to make material changes in the policies and procedures developed by the relevant entities associated with the performance of the IANA functions. The Contractor shall not change or implement the established methods associated with the performance of the IANA functions without prior approval of the COTR.

**C.6.3** The performance of the functions under this contract, including the development of recommendations in connection with processing changes that constitute delegations and redelegations of ccTLDs, shall not be, in any manner, predicated or conditioned on the existence or entry into any contract, agreement or negotiation between the Contractor and any party requesting such changes or any other third-party.

### Questions Related to the Draft SOW

The public is invited to comment on any aspect of the Draft SOW including, but not limited to, the specific questions set forth below. When responding to specific questions, please cite the number(s) of the questions addressed, the “section” of the Draft SOW to which the question(s) correspond, and provide any references to support the responses submitted.

1. Does the language in “Provision C.1.3” capture views on how the relevant stakeholders as sources of the policies and procedures should be referenced in the next IANA functions contract. If not, please propose specific language to capture commenters’ views.

2. Does the new “Provision C.2.2.1.1” adequately address concerns that the IANA functions contractor should refrain from developing policies related to the IANA functions? If not, please provide detailed comments and specific suggestions for improving the language.

3. Does the language in “Provisions C.2.2.1.2, C.2.2.1.3, C.2.2.1.4, and

C.2.2.1.5” adequately address concerns that the IANA functions contractor should perform these services in a manner that best serves the relevant stakeholders? If not, please propose detailed alternative language.

4. Does the language in “Provision C.2.2.1.3” adequately address concerns related to root zone management? If not, please suggest detailed alternative language. Are the timeframes for implementation reasonable?

5. Does the new “Provision C.2.2.1.3.2 Responsibility and Respect for Stakeholders” adequately address concerns related to the root zone management process in particular how the IANA functions contractor should document its decision making with respect to relevant national laws of the jurisdiction which the TLD registry serves, how the TLD reflects community consensus among relevant stakeholders and/or is supported by the global public interest. If not, please provide detailed suggestions for capturing concerns. Are the timeframes for implementation reasonable?

6. Does the new “Section C.3 Security Requirements” adequately address concerns that the IANA functions contractor has a secure communications system for communicating with service recipients? If not, how can the language be improved? Is the timeframe for implementation reasonable?

7. Does the new “Provision C.2.2.1.3.5 Customer Service Complaint Resolution Process” provide an adequate means of addressing customer complaints? Does the new language provide adequate guidance to the IANA functions contractor on how to develop a customer complaint resolution? If not, please provide detailed comments and suggestions for improving the language.

8. Does the new “Provision C.3.6 Contingency and Continuity of Operations Plan (CCOP)” adequately address concerns regarding contingency planning and emergency recovery? If not, please provide detailed comments and suggestions for improving the language. Are the timeframes for implementation reasonable?

9. Does the new “Section C.4 Performance Standards Metric Requirements” adequately address concerns regarding transparency in root zone management process, and performance standards and metrics? Should the contractor be required to gather and report on statistics regarding global IPv6 and DNSSEC deployment? If so, how should this requirement be reflected in the SOW? What statistics should be gathered and made public?

10. Does the new “Section C.5 Audit Requirements” adequately address

concerns regarding audits? If not, please propose alternative language. Are the timeframes for implementation reasonable?

Dated: June 9, 2011.

**Lawrence E. Strickling,**  
Assistant Secretary for Communications and Information.

[FR Doc. 2011-14762 Filed 6-13-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-60-P

## COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION

### SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34-64638; File Nos. 4-633 and S7-39-10]

### Joint Public Roundtable on Proposed Dealer and Major Participant Definitions of Title VII of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act

**AGENCIES:** Commodity Futures Trading Commission (“CFTC”) and Securities and Exchange Commission (“SEC”) (each, an “Agency,” and collectively, the “Agencies”).

**ACTION:** Notice of roundtable discussion; request for comment.

**SUMMARY:** On Thursday, June 16, 2011, commencing at 9 a.m. and ending at 3:45 p.m., staff of the Agencies will hold a public roundtable meeting at which invited participants will discuss various issues related to the proposed definitions of the terms “swap dealer,” “security-based swap dealer,” “major swap participant,” and “major security-based swap participant” under Title VII of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (the “Act”). See 75 FR 80174 (Dec. 21, 2010). The discussion will be open to the public with seating on a first-come, first-served basis. Members of the public may also listen to the meeting by telephone. Call-in participants should be prepared to provide their first name, last name and affiliation. The information for the conference call is set forth below.

- *U.S. Toll-Free:* (866) 844-9416.
- *International Toll:* information on international dialing can be found at the following link: <http://www.cftc.gov/PressRoom/PressReleases/internationalnumbers021811.html>.
- *Conference ID:* 7731946.

A transcript of the public roundtable discussion will be published at <http://www.cftc.gov/PressRoom/Events/2011/index.htm>. The roundtable discussion will take place in the Conference Center at the CFTC’s headquarters, Three

Lafayette Centre, 1155 21st Street, NW., Washington, DC.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** The CFTC's Office of Public Affairs at (202) 418-5080 or the SEC's Office of Public Affairs at (202) 551-4120.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The roundtable discussion will take place on Thursday, June 16, 2011, commencing at 9 a.m. and ending at 3:45 p.m. Members of the public who wish to comment on the topics addressed at the discussion, may do so via:

- Paper submission to David Stawick, Secretary, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, Three Lafayette Centre, 1155 21st Street, NW., Washington, DC 20581, or Elizabeth M. Murphy, Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, 100 F Street, NE., Washington, DC 20549-1090; or

- Electronic submission via visiting <http://comments.cftc.gov/PublicComments/ReleasesWithComments.aspx> and submitting comments through the CFTC's Web site; and/or by e-mail to [rule-comments@sec.gov](mailto:rule-comments@sec.gov) (all e-mails must reference the file numbers 4-633 and S7-39-10 in the subject field) or through the comment form available at: <http://www.sec.gov/rules/other.shtml>.

All submissions will be reviewed jointly by the Agencies. All comments must be in English or be accompanied by an English translation. All submissions provided to either Agency in any electronic form or on paper will be published on the Web site of the respective Agency, without review and without removal of personally identifying information. Please submit only information that you wish to make publicly available.

Dated: June 9, 2011.

By the Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

**David A. Stawick,**

Secretary.

Dated: June 9, 2011.

By the Securities and Exchange Commission.

**Elizabeth M. Murphy,**

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2011-14729 Filed 6-13-11; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE P**

---

## DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

### Notice of Proposed Information Collection Requests

**AGENCY:** Department of Education.

**ACTION:** Comment request.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Education (the Department), 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 and continuing collections of information. This helps the Department assess the impact of its information collection requirements and minimize the reporting burden on the public and helps the public understand the Department's information collection requirements and provide the requested data in the desired format. The Director, Information Collection Clearance Division, Privacy, Information and Records Management Services, Office of Management, invites comments on the proposed information collection requests as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

**DATES:** Interested persons are invited to submit comments on or before August 15, 2011.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments regarding burden and/or the collection activity requirements should be electronically mailed to [ICDocketMgr@ed.gov](mailto:ICDocketMgr@ed.gov) or mailed to U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW., LBJ, Washington, DC 20202-4537. Please note that written comments received in response to this notice will be considered public records.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Section 3506 of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. chapter 35) requires that Federal agencies provide interested parties an early opportunity to comment on information collection requests. The Director, Information Collection Clearance Division, Information Management and Privacy Services, Office of Management, publishes this notice containing proposed information collection requests at the beginning of the Departmental review of the information collection. 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.

Dated: June 8, 2011.

**Darrin A. King,**

Director, Information Collection Clearance Division, Privacy, Information and Records Management Services, Office of Management.

### Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services

*Type of Review:* Extension.

*Title of Collection:* Protection and Advocacy of Individual Rights (PAIR) Program Assurances.

*OMB Control Number:* 1820-0625.

*Agency Form Number(s):* N/A.

*Frequency of Responses:* Submitted once prior to FY 2007, and thereafter only upon the redesignation of the P&A.

*Affected Public:* Not-for-profit institutions.

*Total Estimated Number of Annual Responses:* 57.

*Total Estimated Number of Annual Burden Hours:* 9.

*Abstract:* Section 509 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (act), and its implementing Federal Regulations at 34 CFR Part 381, require the Protection and Advocacy of Individual Rights (PAIR) grantees to submit an application to the Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA) Commissioner in order to receive assistance under Section 509 of the act. The act requires that the application contain Assurances to which the grantee must comply. Section 509(f) of the act specifies the Assurances. There are 57 PAIR grantees. All 57 grantees are required to be part of the protection and advocacy system in each State established under the Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 6041 *et seq.*).

Copies of the proposed information collection request may be accessed from <http://edicsweb.ed.gov>, by selecting the "Browse Pending Collections" link and by clicking on link number 4638. When you access the information collection, click on "Download Attachments" to view. Written requests for information should be addressed to U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW., LBJ, Washington, DC 20202-4537. Requests may also be electronically mailed to [ICDocketMgr@ed.gov](mailto:ICDocketMgr@ed.gov) or faxed to 202-401-0920. Please specify the complete title of the information collection and OMB Control Number when making your request.

Individuals who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1-800-877-8339.

[FR Doc. 2011-14644 Filed 6-13-11; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4000-01-P**