

The Bureau seeks information responsive to the following questions about such covered person or third-party claims.

i. The Bureau is not aware of recent practice by covered persons to bring claims against consumers in arbitration.⁵ Do such arbitrations, in fact, exist at this point? If there are such arbitrations, should the Bureau determine their frequency? If there are no longer such arbitrations, should the Bureau analyze whether covered persons will, in the future, return to bringing claims against consumers in arbitration?

ii. Should the Bureau analyze the types of claims that covered persons bring in arbitration? If covered persons no longer bring claims in arbitration, should the Bureau seek to answer this question for a period in which they did?

iii. For claims that covered persons have brought in arbitration, should the Bureau seek to analyze: (a) the cost and speed of dispute resolution; and/or (b) the outcome of disputes? If covered persons no longer bring claims in arbitration, should the Bureau seek to answer these questions for a period in which they did?

iv. For consumers involved in any such cases, should the Bureau seek to assess their understanding of, and satisfaction with, the resulting arbitration process? If covered persons no longer bring claims in arbitration, should the Bureau seek to answer this question for a period in which they did?

v. If the Bureau should address some or all of the issues identified in 2.B.i–iv above, what methods of study should it use? What new data, if any, should the Bureau seek and from which entities? What existing studies or empirical data, if any, should the Bureau use? Should the Bureau focus on particular product markets? Should the Bureau focus on the impact to arbitral

invoked that agreement to bring claims against a consumer in arbitration. The Bureau intends the following set of questions to cover such third-party claims as well.

⁵Prior to July 2009, the National Arbitration Forum (“NAF”) administered each year a significant number of debt collection arbitrations that various covered persons or third-parties brought against consumers. In July 2009, however, NAF agreed that it would no longer handle consumer arbitrations, including debt collection cases brought against consumers. NAF reached this agreement to settle claims by the Minnesota Attorney General that NAF violated Minnesota’s consumer-fraud, deceptive-trade-practices, and false-advertising statutes. Following the NAF settlement, the American Arbitration Association (“AAA”) announced that it would not administer any consumer finance debt collection arbitrations filed by companies. The AAA’s policy is still in effect according to a “Notice on Consumer Debt Collection Arbitrations” that is available on the organization’s Web site, www.adr.org.

proceedings of particular terms in pre-dispute arbitration agreements?

3. *Impact and Use Outside Particular Arbitral Proceedings*

Independent of their role in particular arbitral proceedings, pre-dispute arbitration agreements may impact consumers and/or covered persons in other ways. Thus, academics and other parties have claimed that the existence of pre-dispute arbitration agreements may impact:

- The incidence and nature of consumer claims against covered persons;
- The price and availability of financial services products to consumers;
- Compliance with consumer financial protection laws;
- Consumer awareness of potential legal claims against covered persons;
- Consumer awareness and understanding of how potential legal claims against covered persons may be resolved; and
- The development, interpretation, and application of the rule of law.

i. Should the Bureau seek to evaluate how the use of pre-dispute arbitration agreements impacts consumers and/or covered persons in one or more of these ways?

ii. Should the Bureau seek to evaluate how the use of pre-dispute arbitration agreements impacts consumers and/or covered persons in any other ways that are independent of their role in particular arbitral proceedings?

iii. If so, and in either case, what methods of study should the Bureau use? What new data, if any, should the Bureau seek and from which entities? What existing studies or empirical data, if any, should the Bureau use? Should the Bureau focus on particular product markets? Should the Bureau focus on the impact of particular terms in pre-dispute arbitration agreements?

Dated: April 23, 2012.

Meredith Fuchs,

Chief of Staff, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection.

[FR Doc. 2012–10189 Filed 4–26–12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4810-AM-P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Office of the Secretary

Notification of an Open Meeting of the National Defense University Board of Visitors (BOV); Correction

AGENCY: National Defense University, DoD.

ACTION: Notice of open meeting; correction.

SUMMARY: On March 30, 2012 (77 FR 19265–19266), the National Defense University Board of Visitors gave notice of a meeting to be held on May 2 and 3, 2012, from 11:30 a.m. to 5 p.m. on May 2 and continuing on May 3 from 8 a.m. to 1 p.m. The Department of Defense announces that the meeting date and time have been changed. All other information in the notice remains the same.

DATES: The new meeting date and time is May 2, 2012 from 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. The meeting originally scheduled for May 3, 2012 has been cancelled.

ADDRESSES: The Board of Visitors meeting will be held at Marshall Hall, Building 62, Room 155, the National Defense University, 300 5th Avenue SW., Fort McNair, Washington, DC 20319–5066.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: The point of contact for this notice is Ms. Dolores Hodge at (202) 685–0082, Fax (202) 685–3748 or HodgeD@ndu.edu.

Dated: April 24, 2012.

Aaron Siegel,

Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.

[FR Doc. 2012–10226 Filed 4–26–12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5001-06-P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Air Force

GPS Satellite Simulator Working Group; Notice of Meeting

AGENCY: The United States Air Force, DoD.

ACTION: Amending GPS Simulator Working group Meeting Notice.

SUMMARY: We are requesting to amend the date of the GPS Simulator Working group meeting notice published on April 20, 2012 under 77 FR 23668. The date of the meeting will now be 15 May 2012 from 0730–1600 (Pacific Standard Time). This meeting notice is to inform the public that the Global Positioning Systems (GPS) Directorate will be hosting an open GPS Satellite Simulator Working Group (SSWG) meeting for manufacturers of GPS constellation simulators utilized by the federal government on 15 May 2012 from 0730–1600 (Pacific Standard Time). The purpose of this meeting is to disseminate information about GPS simulators, discuss current and on-going efforts related to simulators and form a functioning GPS Satellite Simulator