proposed rule would have been to allow canine vaccines that are recommended for use in dogs to be recommended for use in wolves and any dog-wolf cross. We are withdrawing the proposed rule due to the comments we received following its publication.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. Albert P. Morgan, Chief Staff Officer, Operational Support Section, Center for Veterinary Biologics, Licensing and Policy Development, APHIS, 4700 River Road Unit 148, Riverdale, MD 20737–1231; (301) 734–8245.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The regulations at 9 CFR part 101 contain definitions of terms used in the regulations concerning veterinary biologics in 9 CFR parts 101 through 117. On September 28, 1999, we published in the **Federal Register** (64 FR 52247–52248, Docket No. 99–040–1) a proposed rule to amend the regulations by adding a definition of *dog* to include all members of the species *Canis familiaris, Canis lupus,* or any dog-wolf cross. The proposed action would have allowed canine vaccines that are recommended for use in dogs to be recommended for use in wolves and any dog-wolf cross.

The question of whether rabies vaccines approved for use in dogs should be recommended for use in wolves and wolf-dog crosses has been under consideration for at least 5 years. After domestic dogs were reclassified as members of the species *Canis lupus* (gray wolf) in the 1993 edition of the Smithsonian Institute's ''Mammal Species of the World, a Taxonomic and Geographic Reference,'' owners of wolves and wolf-dog crosses petitioned the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) to allow the use of canine rabies vaccines in their animals.

In April 1996, APHIS hosted a meeting to discuss the issue. Experts from the disciplines of animal taxonomy, molecular genetics, veterinary immunology, wildlife biology, and veterinary public health attended. The meeting did not result in a clear consensus among the participants that the immune systems of wolves and dogs are equivalent. Therefore, APHIS took no further action regarding the petition. However, after supporters of the petition submitted followup data showing that over 600 wolves and wolf-dog crosses were vaccinated with canine vaccines without any reported adverse reactions, APHIS decided to publish the proposed rule.

We solicited comments concerning our proposal for 60 days ending on November 29, 1999. We received 79 comments by that date. The comments were from an animal welfare organization, animal rescue organizations, veterinary care facilities, a veterinary biologics manufacturer, veterinary associations, universities, a State agency, wolf and lupine organizations, a wildlife foundation, and private citizens. Most of the commenters who expressed support for the proposed rule were owners and/or fanciers of wolves and dog-wolf hybrids; however, several of the commenters who supported the proposed rule expressed concerns regarding ownership of wolves and dog-wolf crosses. Most of the commenters who were opposed to the proposed rule were concerned that the inclusion of wolves and dog-wolf crosses in the definition of *dog* would validate or encourage the ownership of wolves and dog-wolf crosses, and that such ownership could pose a risk to humans due to the unpredictable behavior of such animals. In addition, two of these commenters noted that the recommended use for a vaccine is typically supported by immunogenicity studies, and they cited the absence of such studies using wolves and dog-wolf crosses.

Many commenters who were in support of the proposed rule were of the view that failure to allow canine rabies vaccines to be recommended for use in wolves and wolf-dog crosses would create a large pool of animals that are susceptible to rabies. On the other hand, commenters also stated that canine rabies vaccines, as well as canine vaccines against other diseases, are widely used off-label. However, commenters also pointed out the fact that States do not recognize that animals administered off-label vaccines are properly vaccinated.

The commenters who opposed the proposed rule expressed three main areas of concern. First, they were of the view that there is insufficient safety and efficacy data established by controlled studies to recommend the use of the vaccines in wolves and wolf-dog crosses. Second, they did not agree that, because there was a lack of reported adverse reactions in approximately 600 vaccinated wolves and wolf-dog crosses, a valid scientific inference can be made that the products can safely and effectively be used in such animals. Third, these commenters, as well as some of those who supported the proposed rule, were concerned that including wolves and wolf-dog crosses in the definition of *dog* definitely sends the wrong message to the public. It was the opinion of the commenters that this type of change in the definition could have an implied meaning of domestication and behavioral traits normally associated with dogs. According to the commenters, such an implication would pose serious safety problems to the public. They stated that wolves and wolf-dog crosses can be highly unpredictable, have instinctive wild behaviors, and should not be promoted as ''pets.''

After carefully considering all of the comments, including those in the area of veterinary medicine and animal health, we have concluded that many of the concerns expressed about allowing canine rabies vaccines to be recommended for use in wolves and wolf-dog crosses have sufficient merit to warrant withdrawal of our proposal and reevaluation of this issue.

Therefore, we are withdrawing the September 28, 1999, proposed rule referenced above. The concerns and recommendations of all of the commenters will be considered if any new proposed regulations regarding the definition of *dog* are developed.

Authority: 21 U.S.C. 151–159; 7 CFR 2.22, 2.80, and 371.4.

Done in Washington, DC, this 12th day of April 2001.

Bobby R. Acord,

Acting Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.

[FR Doc. 01–9624 Filed 4–17–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–34–U

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

10 CFR Part 733

RIN 1901–AA 89

Public Meetings To Obtain Input on DOE's Implementation of Federal Policy on Research Misconduct

AGENCY: U.S. Department of Energy (DOE).

ACTION: Notice of public meetings and request for comments.

SUMMARY: DOE is initiating the development of a rulemaking to implement the Federal policy on research misconduct that was issued by the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy. The responsibility involves developing a DOE-complex wide policy on research misconduct and the necessary rulemaking to implement the policy. The rulemaking will include a definition of research misconduct as well as procedures for handling allegations of research misconduct. To begin this process, the DOE is holding a series of public meetings to obtain

input from persons and organizations with interests in this area.

DATES: Written comments can be submitted on or before June 20, 2001. If you anticipate that you will be submitting comments but find it difficult to do so within the period of time allowed by this notice, you should advise Anne Marie Zerega at the address below, as soon as possible. The meetings are being held on May 10, June 12, June 14, and June 20.

ADDRESSES: All comments or requests for information should be sent to Anne Marie Zerega, Senior Analyst, Office of Planning and Analysis, Office of Science, SC–5, U.S. Department of Energy, Washington, D.C. 20585 Tel: 202–586–4477 Fax: 202–586–7719 e-mail: *Anne-Marie.Zerega@science.doe.gov*.

Four meetings are scheduled:

May 10, 2001, 10:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m., Berkner Auditorium, Building 488, 11 Brookhaven Avenue, Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, New York 11973–5000, Phone: 631–344–8000

June 12, 2001, 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m., Stanford Linear Accelerator Center, Stanford University, 2575 Sand Hill Road, Menlo Park, CA 94025

June 14, 2001, 10:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m., Location: Jefferson County School Board Room, 1829 Denver West Drive, Building 27, Golden, CO 80401. The board room is on the 5th floor.

June 20, 2001, 10:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m., Auditorium, U.S. Department of Energy, 19901 Germantown Road, Germantown, MD 20874–1290, 301–903–3000

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Anne Marie Zevega, (202) 586–4477.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Each meeting will have the same agenda:

10:00 a.m. to 11:30 a.m. (9:00 a.m. to 10:30 a.m. in California)
Presentations by DOE officials from General Counsel, the Office of Science, and the Office of Hearings and Appeals

11:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (10:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. in California)
Question and Comments will be taken from the floor during this period. There will be a one-hour break for lunch.

4:00 p.m. (3:00 p.m. in California)
Adjourn

Advances in science, engineering, and all fields of research depend on the reliability of the research record, as do the benefits associated with them in areas such as health and national security. Sustained public trust in the research enterprise also requires confidence in the research record and in the processes involved in its ongoing development. For these reasons, and in the interest of achieving greater uniformity in Federal policies in this area, the National Science and Technology Council (NSTC) initiated the development of a Federal research misconduct policy in April 1996. The Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) provided leadership and coordination, and all Federal agencies with a research mission participated. The final policy was printed in the **Federal Register** on December 6, 2000 (66 FR 76260).

This policy applies to federally-funded research and proposals submitted to Federal agencies for research funding. It thus applies to research conducted by the Federal agencies, conducted or managed for the Federal government by contractors, or supported by the Federal government and performed at research institutions, including universities and industry.

The NSTC policy establishes the scope of the Federal government's interest in the accuracy and reliability of the research record and the processes involved in its development. It consists of a definition of research misconduct and basic guidelines for the response of Federal agencies and research institutions to allegations of research misconduct.

The Federal agencies that conduct or support research are charged with implementing this policy within one year of the date of its issuance. An NSTC interagency research misconduct policy implementation group has been established to help achieve uniformity across the Federal agencies in implementation of the research misconduct policy. In some cases, this may require agencies to amend or replace extant regulations addressing research misconduct. In other cases, agencies may need to put new regulations in place or implement the policy through administrative mechanisms.

The policy addresses research misconduct. It does not supersede government or institutional policies or procedures for addressing other forms of misconduct, such as the unethical treatment of human research subjects or mistreatment of laboratory animals used in research, nor does it supersede criminal or other civil law. Agencies and institutions may address these other issues as authorized by law and as appropriate to their missions and objectives.

A copy of the OSTP policy published in the **Federal Register** may be viewed at: *www.science.doe.gov/misconduct*

Issued in Washington DC on April 4, 2001.

James Decker,

Director (Acting), Office of Science.

[FR Doc. 01–9464 Filed 4–17–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Office of the Comptroller of the Currency

12 CFR Parts 7 and 37

[Docket No. 01–07]

RIN 1557–AB75

Debt Cancellation Contracts and Debt Suspension Agreements

AGENCY: Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Treasury.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Office of the Comptroller of the Currency (OCC) is proposing to add a new part 37 to its regulations that addresses debt cancellation contracts (DCCs) and debt suspension agreements (DSAs). The purposes of the customer protections set forth in the proposed rule are to facilitate customers' informed choice about whether to purchase DCCs and DSAs, based on an understanding of the costs, benefits, and limitations of the products and to discourage inappropriate or abusive sales practices. In addition, the proposed rule promotes safety and soundness by requiring national banks that provide these products to maintain adequate loss reserves.

DATES: Comments must be received by June 18, 2001.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be directed to Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Public Information Room, 250 E Street, SW., Mail Stop 1–5, Washington, DC 20219, Attention: Docket No. 01–07; Fax number (202) 874–4448 or Internet address: regs.comments@occ.treas.gov. Comments may be inspected and photocopied at the OCC's Public Reference Room, 250 E Street, SW., Washington, DC. You can make an appointment to inspect the comments by calling (202) 874–5043.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Stuart Feldstein, Assistant Director, or Jean Campbell, Attorney, Legislative and Regulatory Activities Division, (202) 874–5090; or Suzette Greco, Special Counsel, Securities and Corporate Practice Division, (202) 874–5210, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, 250 E Street, SW., Washington, DC 20219.