

about respondents' instructional courses using statements that gave readers the impression the endorsements had been submitted by ordinary consumers or independent reviewers. Respondents failed to implement a reasonable monitoring program to ensure that these postings clearly and prominently disclosed the compensated nature of the affiliates' relationship to respondents.

The Commission's complaint alleges that respondents violated Section 5 of the FTC Act by disseminating or causing to be disseminated reviews of their instructional courses that misrepresented that they were those of independent, ordinary consumers. The complaint further alleges that respondents violated Section 5 by failing to disclose, or disclose adequately, that the affiliates receive financial compensation from the sale of respondents' products.

Part I of the proposed order prohibits respondents, in connection with the advertising of any product or service, from misrepresenting the status of any user or endorser of a product or service, including, but not limited to, misrepresenting that the user or endorser is an independent user or ordinary consumer of the product or service.

Part II prohibits respondents from making any representation about any user or endorser of a product or service unless they disclose, clearly and prominently, a material connection, when one exists, between the user or endorser of the product or service and any other party involved in promoting that product or service. The proposed order defines "material connection" as any relationship that materially affects the weight or credibility of any endorsement and would not be reasonably expected by consumers.

Part III requires respondents to take immediate steps to ensure compliance with Parts I and II of the order, including maintaining a system to review and monitor their affiliate representations and disclosures. The proposed order requires respondents to determine, on a semi-annual basis, their top fifty (50) revenue-generating affiliates, and then monitor, on a monthly basis, the Web sites of those affiliates and the Web sites of a random sample of fifty (50) of their remaining affiliates. Part III also requires respondents to terminate any affiliate who engages in conduct inconsistent with Parts I and II of the order and to maintain reports regarding compliance with Part III of the order.

Part IV requires respondents to serve copies of the order to prospective affiliates prior to their entry into

respondents' affiliate program, and to current affiliates within ten days of the date of service of the order.

Part V requires respondents to pay to the Commission a sum of \$250,000. This payment may be used in the Commission's sole discretion to provide appropriate relief, which may include, but is not limited to, the rescission of contracts, payment of damages, and/or public notification respecting the unfair or deceptive acts or practices alleged in the complaint. If the Commission determines that such relief is wholly or partially impracticable, any or all such funds shall be paid to the United States Treasury.

Parts VI through X of the proposed order require respondents to: Keep copies of relevant consumer complaints and inquiries, documents demonstrating order compliance, and any documents relating to any representation covered by this order; provide copies of the order to certain of their personnel; notify the Commission of changes in corporate structure that might affect compliance obligations under the order; notify the Commission of changes in corporate business or employment as to respondent Lester Gabriel Smith individually; and file compliance reports with the Commission. Part XI provides that the order will terminate after twenty (20) years, with certain exceptions.

The purpose of this analysis is to facilitate public comment on the proposed order, and it is not intended to constitute an official interpretation of the agreement and proposed order or to modify in any way their terms.

By direction of the Commission.

Donald S. Clark,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2011-6491 Filed 3-18-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6750-01-P

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

[File No. 102 3087]

Chitika, Inc.; Analysis of Proposed Consent Order To Aid Public Comment

AGENCY: Federal Trade Commission.

ACTION: Proposed consent agreement.

SUMMARY: The consent agreement in this matter settles alleged violations of federal law prohibiting unfair or deceptive acts or practices or unfair methods of competition. The attached Analysis to Aid Public Comment describes both the allegations in the draft complaint and the terms of the consent order—embodied in the consent agreement—that would settle these allegations.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before April 14, 2011.

ADDRESSES: Interested parties are invited to submit written comments electronically or in paper form. Comments should refer to "Chitika, File No. 102 3087" to facilitate the organization of comments. Please note that your comment—including your name and your state—will be placed on the public record of this proceeding, including on the publicly accessible FTC Web site, at <http://www.ftc.gov/os/publiccomments.shtml>.

Because comments will be made public, they should not include any sensitive personal information, such as an individual's Social Security Number; date of birth; driver's license number or other state identification number, or foreign country equivalent; passport number; financial account number; or credit or debit card number. Comments also should not include any sensitive health information, such as medical records or other individually identifiable health information. In addition, comments should not include any "[t]rade secret or any commercial or financial information which is obtained from any person and which is privileged or confidential * * *" as provided in Section 6(f) of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. 46(f), and Commission Rule 4.10(a)(2), 16 CFR 4.10(a)(2). Comments containing material for which confidential treatment is requested must be filed in paper form, must be clearly labeled "Confidential", and must comply with FTC Rule 4.9(c), 16 CFR 4.9(c).¹

Because paper mail addressed to the FTC is subject to delay due to heightened security screening, please consider submitting your comments in electronic form. Comments filed in electronic form should be submitted by using the following weblink: <https://ftcpublish.commentworks.com/ftc/chitika> and following the instructions on the Web-based form. To ensure that the Commission considers an electronic comment, you must file it on the Web-based form at the <https://ftcpublish.commentworks.com/ftc/chitika>. If this Notice appears at <http://www.regulations.gov/search/index.jsp>, you may also file an electronic comment through that Web site. The Commission will consider all comments that regulations.gov forwards

¹ The comment must be accompanied by an explicit request for confidential treatment, including the factual and legal basis for the request, and must identify the specific portions of the comment to be withheld from the public record. The request will be granted or denied by the Commission's General Counsel, consistent with applicable law and the public interest. See FTC Rule 4.9(c), 16 CFR 4.9(c).

to it. You may also visit the FTC Web site at <http://www.ftc.gov/> to read the Notice and the news release describing it.

A comment filed in paper form should include the "Chitika, File No. 102 3087" reference both in the text and on the envelope, and should be mailed or delivered to the following address: Federal Trade Commission, Office of the Secretary, Room H-113 (Annex D), 600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20580. The FTC is requesting that any comment filed in paper form be sent by courier or overnight service, if possible, because U.S. postal mail in the Washington area and at the Commission is subject to delay due to heightened security precautions.

The Federal Trade Commission Act ("FTC Act") and other laws the Commission administers permit the collection of public comments to consider and use in this proceeding as appropriate. The Commission will consider all timely and responsive public comments that it receives, whether filed in paper or electronic form. Comments received will be available to the public on the FTC Web site, to the extent practicable, at <http://www.ftc.gov/os/publiccomments.shtm>. As a matter of discretion, the Commission makes every effort to remove home contact information for individuals from the public comments it receives before placing those comments on the FTC Web site. More information, including routine uses permitted by the Privacy Act, may be found in the FTC's privacy policy, at <http://www.ftc.gov/ftc/privacy.shtm>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Peder Magee (202-326-3538) or Tracy Shapiro (202-326-2343), FTC Bureau of Consumer Protection, 600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20580.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Pursuant to section 6(f) of the Federal Trade Commission Act, 38 Stat. 721, 15 U.S.C. 46(f), and § 2.34 the Commission Rules of Practice, 16 CFR 2.34, notice is hereby given that the above-captioned consent agreement containing a consent order to cease and desist, having been filed with and accepted, subject to final approval, by the Commission, has been placed on the public record for a period of thirty (30) days. The following Analysis to Aid Public Comment describes the terms of the consent agreement, and the allegations in the complaint. An electronic copy of the full text of the consent agreement package can be obtained from the FTC Home Page (for March 14, 2010), on the

World Wide Web, at <http://www.ftc.gov/os/actions.shtm>. A paper copy can be obtained from the FTC Public Reference Room, Room 130-H, 600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20580, either in person or by calling (202) 326-2222.

Public comments are invited, and may be filed with the Commission in either paper or electronic form. All comments should be filed as prescribed in the **ADDRESSES** section above, and must be received on or before the date specified in the **DATES** section.

Analysis of Agreement Containing Consent Order To Aid Public Comment

The Federal Trade Commission has accepted, subject to final approval, a consent agreement from Chitika, Inc. ("Chitika").

The proposed consent order has been placed on the public record for thirty (30) days for receipt of comments by interested persons. Comments received during this period will become part of the public record. After thirty (30) days, the Commission will again review the agreement and the comments received, and will decide whether it should withdraw from the agreement and take appropriate action or make final the agreement's proposed order.

Chitika is a network advertiser that engages in online behavioral advertising, the practice of tracking consumers' activities online in order to serve them targeted advertisements based upon their individual Web browsing activity. Chitika offers an online behavioral advertising service in which it acts as an intermediary between Web site publishers and advertisers that wish to have their advertisements placed on websites. Chitika tracks the searches a consumer has conducted, the websites visited, and the content viewed in order to serve advertising targeted to the individual consumer's interests. When a consumer visits a Web site within Chitika's network of Web site publishers, Chitika sets a new cookie or automatically receives a cookie it has previously set in the consumer's browser (the "Chitika tracking cookie"). Chitika uses cookies to serve advertisements to consumers that are targeted to their interests.

The Commission alleges that representations Chitika made in its privacy policy regarding consumers' ability to opt out of receiving tracking cookies were false or misleading. Chitika's privacy policy stated that consumers could opt out of receiving Chitika cookies. For those consumers who elected to opt out, Chitika set an "opt-out cookie" in the consumer's browser so that no additional cookies

would be set in the consumer's browser, no additional information would be added to a previously set Chitika tracking cookie, and the data previously placed in the cookie would no longer be used to target advertisements to the consumer. From at least May 2008 to February 28, 2010, however, Chitika delivered opt-out cookies that were set to expire after ten (10) days. Accordingly, the complaint alleges that Chitika deceived consumers and violated Section 5 of the FTC Act by making an unqualified claim that consumers could opt out of targeted advertising when the opt out expired in ten (10) days.

Part I of the proposed order prohibits Chitika from misrepresenting (1) the extent of its data collection about consumers and (2) the extent to which consumers are able to control the collection, use, or sharing of their data.

Part II of the proposed order requires Chitika to take a number of steps to improve the transparency of, and consumers' ability to control, its collection of consumer data for online behavioral advertising. First, within thirty (30) days after service of the proposed order, Chitika must place a clear and prominent notice with a hyperlink on the homepage of its Web site that states: "We collect information about your activities on certain websites to send you targeted advertisements. To opt out of Chitika's targeted ads, click *here*." The mechanism that Chitika provides to allow consumers to prevent Chitika from collecting information about them must remain in effect for a minimum of five (5) years. Within close proximity to the mechanism, Chitika must disclose: (1) That Chitika collects information about consumers' activities on certain websites to deliver targeted ads; (2) that by opting out, Chitika will not collect this information to deliver such ads; (3) consumers' current choice status (*i.e.*, whether opted in or opted out of tracking); and (4) that consumers' choice is specific to the browser they are using (*i.e.*, if they switch browsers or devices, they will have to opt out again).

Part II of the proposed order includes two additional provisions. First, for a period of one (1) year, near the notice and hyperlink discussed above, Chitika's homepage must state that: "If you opted out of our targeted ads before March 1, 2010, the opt-out has expired and you must opt out again to avoid targeted ads."

The final provision in Part II requires that within any behaviorally targeted advertisement that Chitika serves, it must include a hyperlink that takes consumers directly to the required choice mechanism. The hyperlink text

must state: "Opt out?" When a consumer's cursor, or equivalent, is placed over the hyperlink, a box shall be visible that clearly and prominently states, "Opt out of Chitika's targeted ads."

Part III of the proposed order restricts Chitika's use of any data that it collected from consumers prior to March 1, 2010, the date on which Chitika extended the expiration date of its opt-out cookies from ten (10) days to ten (10) years. Specifically, the proposed order prevents Chitika from using, selling, or transferring "any information that can be associated with a Chitika user or a Chitika user's computer or device" that the company obtained prior to March 1, 2010. In addition to restricting the use of this data, within sixty (60) days after the service of the order, Chitika must delete any such information stored in Chitika users' cookies and any information retained in Chitika's files that would allow the information to be associated with a particular consumer or that consumer's computer or device.

Parts IV through VIII of the proposed order are reporting and compliance provisions. Part IV requires Chitika to retain documents relating to its compliance with the order. Part V requires dissemination of the order to all current and future principals, officers, directors, managers, employees, agents, and representatives having responsibilities relating to the subject matter of the order. Part VI ensures notification to the FTC of changes in corporate status. Part VII mandates that Chitika submit a report to the Commission detailing its compliance with the order. Part VIII provides that the order expires after twenty (20) years, with certain exceptions.

The purpose of the analysis is to aid public comment on the proposed order. It is not intended to constitute an official interpretation of the proposed order or to modify its terms in any way.

By direction of the Commission.

Donald S. Clark,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2011-6493 Filed 3-18-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6750-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

[30Day-11-11BM]

Agency Forms Undergoing Paperwork Reduction Act Review

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) publishes a list of information collection requests under review by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) in compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. chapter 35). To request a copy of these requests, call the CDC Reports Clearance Officer at (404) 639-5960 or send an e-mail to omb@cdc.gov. Send written comments to CDC Desk Officer, Office of Management and Budget, Washington, DC 20503 or by fax to (202) 395-5806. Written comments should be received within 30 days of this notice.

Proposed Project

Healthcare System Surge Capacity at the Community Level—New-National Center for Emerging and Zoonotic Infectious Diseases, (NCEZID), Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, (CDC).

Background and Brief Description

The Healthcare Preparedness Activity, Division of Healthcare Quality Promotion (DHQP) at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) works with other federal agencies, state governments, medical societies and other public and private organizations to promote collaboration amongst healthcare partners, and to integrate healthcare preparedness into federal, state and local public health preparedness planning. The goal of the Activity is to help local communities' healthcare delivery and public health sectors effectively and efficiently prepare for and respond to urgent and emergent threats.

Surge is defined as a marked increase in demand for resources such as personnel, space and material. Health care providers manage both routine surge (predictable fluctuations in demand associated with the weekly calendar, for example) as well as unusual surge (larger fluctuations in demand caused by rarer events such as pandemic influenza). Except in extraordinary cases, providers are expected to manage surge while adhering to their existing standards for quality and patient safety.

Currently, health care organizations are expected to prepare for and respond to surges in demand ranging from a severe catastrophe (for example, a nuclear detonation) to more common, less severe events (for example, a worse-than-usual influenza season). CDC and other federal agencies have dedicated considerable funding and technical assistance towards developing and coordinating community-level responses to surges in demand, but it remains a difficult task.

While there is extensive research on managing collaborations during times of extraordinary pressure where response to surge takes precedence over other activities, less is known about developing and maintaining integrated collaborations during periods where the system must respond to unusual surge but also continue the routine provision of health care. In particular, studies have not explored how these collaborations can build on sustainable relationships between a broad range of stakeholders (including primary care providers) in communities with different market structures and different degrees of investment in public health.

This study aims to generate information about the role of community-based collaborations in disaster preparedness that the CDC can use to develop its programs guiding and supporting these collaborations. This project will explore barriers and facilitators to coordination on surge response in ten communities, eight of which have been studied longitudinally since the mid-1990s as part of the Center for Studying Health System Change's (HSC's) Community Tracking Study (CTS). Interviews of local healthcare stakeholders will be conducted at 10 sites.

Interviews will be conducted at a total of 63 organizations over the two years of this project. Within each of the ten communities studied, two emergency practitioner respondents (one from a safety-net hospital and one from a non-safety-net hospital), two primary care providers (one from a large practice and one from a small practice) and two local preparedness experts (one from the County or local public health agency, and one coordinator or collaboration leader) will be interviewed. In three sites (Phoenix, Greenville and Seattle) an additional respondent will be identified from an outlying rural area to offer the perspective of providers in those communities. There is no cost to respondents except their time. The total annualized burden is 63 hours.