

as compared to an examination by a dermatologist.<sup>10</sup>

Thus, the orders impose a high level of substantiation despite lacking evidence that the marketing claims require such substantiation, and the complaints' vague claim construction obscures this flawed approach.<sup>11</sup> Despite the assurances in the majority's statement as to what the orders require, the complaints imply—and the majority appears to agree<sup>12</sup>—that reasonable consumers expected the apps to substitute for professional medical care. This disconnect raises the possibility that the Commission may use vague complaints to impose very high substantiation standards on health-related apps even if the advertising claims for those apps are more modest.

This approach concerns me. Health-related apps have enormous potential to improve access to health information for underserved populations and to enable individuals to monitor more effectively their own well-being, thereby improving health outcomes. Health-related apps need not be as accurate as professional care to provide significant value for many consumers. The Commission should not subject such apps to overly stringent substantiation requirements, so long as developers adequately convey the limitations of their products. In particular, the Commission should be very wary of concluding that consumers interpret marketing for health-related apps as claiming that those apps substitute for professional medical care, unless we can point to express claims, clearly implied claims, or extrinsic evidence. If the Commission continues to adopt such conclusions without any

<sup>10</sup> When the FTC cannot "conclude with confidence" that a specific implied claim is being made—for example, if the ad contains "conflicting messages"—the FTC "will not find the ad to make the implied claim unless extrinsic evidence allows us to conclude that such a reading of the ad is reasonable." In re Thompson Med. Co., 104 F.T.C. 648, 788–89 (1984).

<sup>11</sup> These onerous substantiation requirements cannot be defended as "fencing-in." The FTC does not traditionally fence in companies by requiring a heightened level of substantiation. Instead, past FTC decisions fence in companies by extending the scope of a substantiation requirement beyond the specific product, parties, or type of conduct involved in the actual violation. See Federal Trade Commission v. Springtech 77376, LLC, et al. ("Cedarcode Industries"), Matter No. X120042, Dissenting Statement of Commissioner Maureen K. Ohlhausen at 3 (July 16, 2013). Requiring past violators to meet a higher burden of substantiation would not fence them in—it would only make it more difficult for them to make truthful claims that could be useful to consumers. Id.

<sup>12</sup> "Commissioner Ohlhausen . . . believes . . . that it is not reasonable to read the ads as claiming that the automated assessment is as accurate as a dermatologist. We disagree." Statement of Chairwoman Ramirez, Commissioner Brill, and Commissioner McSweeney at 1.

evidence of consumers' actual interpretations, and thus requires a very high level of substantiation for health-related apps, we are likely to chill innovation in such apps, limit the potential benefits of this innovation, and ultimately make consumers worse off.<sup>13</sup>

I therefore respectfully dissent.

[FR Doc. 2015–04348 Filed 3–2–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6750–01–P

## DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

### Meeting of the National Preparedness and Response Science Board

**AGENCY:** Office of the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** As stipulated by the Federal Advisory Committee Act, the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) is hereby giving notice that the National Preparedness and Response Science Board (NPRSB), also known as the National Biodefense Science Board, will be holding a public teleconference.

**DATES:** The NPRSB will hold a public meeting on March 30, 2015, from 1:00 p.m. to 2:00 p.m. EST. The agenda is subject to change as priorities dictate.

**ADDRESSES:** Individuals who wish to participate should send an email to [NPRSB@HHS.GOV](mailto:NPRSB@HHS.GOV) with "NPRSB Registration" in the subject line. The meeting will occur by teleconference. To attend via teleconference and for further instructions, please visit the NPRSB Web site at [WWW.PHE.GOV/NPRSB](http://WWW.PHE.GOV/NPRSB).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Please submit an inquiry via the NPRSB Contact Form located at [www.phe.gov/NBSBComments](http://www.phe.gov/NBSBComments).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Pursuant to section 319M of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247d–7f) and section 222 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 217a), HHS established the NPRSB. The Board shall provide expert advice and guidance to the Secretary on scientific, technical, and

<sup>13</sup> See, e.g., Scott Gottlieb and Coleen Klasmeier, "Why Your Phone Isn't as Smart as It Could Be," Wall Street Journal (Aug. 7, 2014) (blaming heavy regulation of consumer-directed health apps and devices for smartphones that are "purposely dumbed down" and "products that are never created because mobile-tech entrepreneurs choose to direct their talents elsewhere"), available at <http://online.wsj.com/articles/scott-gottlieb-and-coleen-klasmeier-why-your-phone-isnt-as-smart-as-it-could-be-1407369163>.

other matters of special interest to HHS regarding current and future chemical, biological, nuclear, and radiological agents, whether naturally occurring, accidental, or deliberate. The NPRSB may also provide advice and guidance to the Secretary and/or the Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response (ASPR) on other matters related to public health emergency preparedness and response.

**Background:** This public meeting via teleconference will be dedicated to the NPRSB's deliberation and vote on the findings from the ASPR Future Strategies Working Group. Subsequent agenda topics will be added as priorities dictate. Any additional agenda topics will be available on the NPRSB March 30, 2015, meeting Web page, available at [WWW.PHE.GOV/NPRSB](http://WWW.PHE.GOV/NPRSB).

**Availability of Materials:** The meeting agenda and materials will be posted prior to the meeting on the March 30th meeting Web page at [WWW.PHE.GOV/NPRSB](http://WWW.PHE.GOV/NPRSB).

**Procedures for Providing Public Input:** Members of the public are invited to attend by teleconference via a toll-free call-in phone number which is available on the NPRSB Web site at [WWW.PHE.GOV/NPRSB](http://WWW.PHE.GOV/NPRSB). All members of the public are encouraged to provide written comment to the NPRSB. All written comments must be received prior to March 29, 2015, and should be sent by email to [NPRSB@HHS.GOV](mailto:NPRSB@HHS.GOV) with "NPRSB Public Comment" as the subject line. Public comments received by close of business one week prior to each teleconference will be distributed to the NPRSB in advance.

Dated: February 24, 2015.

**Nicole Lurie,**

*Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response.*

[FR Doc. 2015–04303 Filed 3–2–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

## DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

### Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

#### Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices (ACIP)

Correction: This notice was published in the **Federal Register** on January 30, 2015, Volume 80, Number 20, Page 5116–5117. Due to inclement weather in the Atlanta, Georgia area, the first day of the meeting scheduled for February 25 and 26, 2015 was not held. The second day of the meeting will take place as follows: