

individuals associated with the grant applications, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.

Name of Committee: National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases Special Emphasis Panel; The Development of Monoclonal Antibodies for Type A Botulinum Neurotoxin.

Date: April 24, 2006.

Time: 2 p.m. to 4 p.m.

Agenda: To review and evaluate contract proposals.

Place: National Institutes of Health, Rockledge 6700, 6700B Rockledge Drive, Bethesda, MD 20817 (Telephone Conference Call).

Contact Person: Eleazar Cohen, PhD, Scientific Review Administrator, Scientific Review Program, Division of Extramural Activities, NIAID/NIH/DHHS, Room 3129, 6700 B Rockledge Drive, Bethesda, MD 20892. (301) 435-3564. ec17w@nih.gov.

This notice is being published less than 15 days prior to the meeting due to the timing limitations imposed by the review and funding cycle.

Name of Committee: National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases Special Emphasis Panel, Teleconference Review of a Stem Cell Therapy Program Project Application.

Date: May 1, 2006.

Time: 12 p.m. to 5 p.m.

Agenda: To review and evaluate grant applications.

Place: National Institutes of Health, Rockledge 6700, 6700B Rockledge Drive, Room 3118, Bethesda, MD 20817 (Telephone Conference Call).

Contact Person: Quirijn Vos, PhD, Scientific Review Administrator, Scientific Review Program, Division of Extramural Activities, NIAID/NIH/DHHS, 6700B Rockledge Drive, MSC 7616, Bethesda, MD 20892. (301) 451-2666. qvoss@niaid.nih.gov.

Name of Committee: National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases Special Emphasis Panel; NIAID Clinical Trial Planning (R34) Grants.

Date: May 3, 2006.

Time: 1 p.m. to 2 p.m.

Agenda: To review and evaluate grant applications.

Place: National Institutes of Health, Rockledge 6700, 6700B Rockledge Drive, Bethesda, MD 20817, (Telephone Conference Call).

Contact Person: Hagit S. David, PhD, Scientific Review Administrator, Scientific Review Program, Division of Extramural Activities, NIAID/NIH/DHHS, 6700B Rockledge Drive, MSC 7616, Bethesda, MD 20892. (301) 402-4596. hdauid@niaid.nih.gov.

(Catalogue of Federal Domestic Assistance Program Nos. 93.855, Allergy, Immunology, and Transplantation Research; 93.856, Microbiology and Infectious Diseases Research, National Institutes of Health, HHS)

Dated: April 5, 2006.

Anna Snouffer,

Acting Director, Office of Federal Advisory Committee Policy.

[FR Doc. 06-3517 Filed 4-12-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4140-01-M

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration

Changes to the National Registry of Evidence-Based Programs and Practices (NREPP); Correction

Authority: Sec. 501, Pub. L. 106-310.

SUMMARY: The Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) published a notice regarding changes to the National Registry of Evidence-based Programs and Practices (NREPP) in the March 14, 2006 **Federal Register**. This document contained several comments from the American Psychological Association's Division 50 Committee on Evidence-based Practice that were incorrectly attributed to the full American Psychological Association.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. Kevin Hennessy, (240) 276-2234.

Correction

In the **Federal Register** of March 14, 2006, FR volume 71, no. 49, the following comments were attributed to the American Psychological Association's Committee on Evidence-based Practice, and should have been attributed to the American Psychological Association's Division 50 Committee on Evidence-based Practice. These comments should be corrected as follows:

Page 13133, Column 3—The American Psychological Association (APA) Division 50 Committee on Evidence-based Practice recommended greater emphasis on the utility descriptors (i.e., those items describing material and resources to support implementation), stating, “these are key outcomes for implementation and they are not adequately addressed in the description of NREPP provided to date. This underscores earlier concerns noted about the transition from efficacy to effectiveness.” The APA Division 50 committee noted that generalizability of programs listed on NREPP will remain an issue until this “gap between efficacy and effectiveness” is explicitly addressed under a revised review system.

Page 13140, Column 1—the American Psychological Association (APA) Division 50 Committee on Evidence-based Practice recommended more emphasis on the utility descriptors “as these are key outcomes for implementation and they are not adequately addressed in the description of NREPP provided to date. This underscores earlier concerns noted about the transition from effectiveness to efficacy.”

Page 13140, Columns 1 and 2—The possibility that NREPP will exclude programs due to lack of funding was a concern voiced by several organizations, including the National Association for Children of Alcoholics, the APA Division 50 Committee on Evidence-based Practice the National Association of State Alcohol and Drug Abuse Directors, Community Anti-Drug Coalitions of America, and the California Association of Alcohol and Drug Program Executives.

Page 13140, Column 3—A number of respondents noted the proposed NREPP approach does not acknowledge provider effects on treatment outcomes. The APA Division 50 Committee on Evidence-based Practice wrote, “Relationship factors in a therapeutic process may be more important than specific interventions and may in fact be the largest determinant in psychotherapy outcome (see Lambert & Barley, 2002). How will NREPP address this concern and make this apparent to users?”

Page 13141, Column 2—The APA Division 50 Committee on Evidence-based Practice suggested that the proposed NREPP approach does not adequately distinguish between “efficacy” and “effectiveness,” and strongly recommended that SAMHSA look for ways to bridge the two.

Page 13142, Column 1—A group of university researchers recommended that for programs to be included in NREPP, they should be required to provide statistically significant results on drug use and/or mental health outcomes using two-tailed tests of significance at $p < .05$. The APA Division 50 Committee on Evidence-based Practice recommended further discussion and consideration by NREPP of the conceptual distinction between statistical and clinical significance.

Page 13142, Column 3—The APA Division 50 Committee on Evidence-based Practice argued that “including all of these NREPP products is seen as a desirable feature that reflects the continuous nature of evidence. This may also be critical information for providing reasonable options for

stakeholders when there are not or few evidence-based practices available.”

Page 13143, Column 2—The APA Division 50 Committee on Evidence-based Practice suggested that SAMHSA develop “a comprehensive glossary that addresses definitions of different constituencies, populations, and settings.”

Page 13144, Column 3—The APA Division 50 Committee on Evidence-based Practice recommended that SAMHSA “anticipate misuses of NREPP so as to insure that funding bodies do not mistakenly assume that improving treatment comes from confining treatment to a list of recommended techniques.”

Page 13146, Columns 2—The APA Division 50 Committee on Evidence-based Practice suggested using a site glossary to define diagnostic terminology and client populations and communities.

Dated: April 3, 2006.

Charles G. Curie,
Administrator.

[FR Doc. 06–3538 Filed 4–12–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4160–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Office of the Secretary

Privacy Act of 1974; Systems of Records

AGENCY: Privacy Office, Department of Homeland Security.

ACTION: Notice of removal of two Privacy Act systems of records.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Privacy Act of 1974, the Department of Homeland Security is giving notice that it proposes to remove two systems of records from its inventory of record systems because they have become obsolete.

DATES: *Effective Date:* April 13, 2006.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Maureen Cooney, Acting Chief Privacy Officer, Department of Homeland Security, 601 S. 12th Street, Arlington, VA 22202, by telephone (571) 227–3813 or facsimile (571) 227–4171.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Pursuant to the provisions of the Privacy Act of 1974, 5 U.S.C. 552a, and as part of its ongoing integration and management efforts, the Department of Homeland Security is removing two obsolete systems of records from its inventory of record systems.

The first one is currently being maintained by United States Citizenship

and Immigration Services and was formerly maintained by the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS). This legacy record system is entitled “Designated Entity Information Management System (DEIMS),” last published in the **Federal Register** as “JUSTICE/INS–021,” (62 FR 39256), when the INS was still a part of the United States Department of Justice. The system became part of the DHS inventory of record systems upon creation of DHS and the merger with INS.

This system was originally established in order to maintain records concerning individuals who applied for and received certification from INS to serve as designated fingerprint service providers. The record system is no longer needed, however, because the INS—and now DHS—no longer uses the services of designated fingerprint service providers. Instead, aliens applying for immigration benefits must have their fingerprints taken by DHS, by state and local law enforcement agencies, by consular offices of the Department of State, or by Department of Defense offices authorized to perform fingerprinting services. Therefore, JUSTICE/INS–021, the “Designated Entity Information Management System (DEIMS)” is obsolete and the Department of Homeland Security is removing this system from its inventory of Privacy Act systems.

For similar reasons, DHS proposes to remove another legacy system of records that is now being maintained by the Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement, but which was formerly maintained by INS when it was part of the Department of Justice. This legacy record system is entitled “Job Exchange System (JOBX).” and it was last published as JUSTICE/INS–009 in the **Federal Register** on September 7, 2001 (66 FR 46815). JOBX was originally established in order to enable INS employees meeting specific criteria to trade like positions with other INS employees upon supervisor approval. The record system has become obsolete, however, as DHS no longer authorizes job swapping among employees. Therefore, the Department of Homeland Security is also removing JUSTICE/INS–009 from its inventory of Privacy Act systems.

Eliminating these two systems will have no adverse impacts on individuals, but will promote the overall streamlining and management of DHS Privacy Act record systems.

Dated: April 4, 2006.

Maureen Cooney,

Acting Chief Privacy Officer.

[FR Doc. E6–5350 Filed 4–12–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–10–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Bureau of Customs and Border Protection

Proposed Collection; Comment Request Protest

ACTION: Notice and request for comments.

SUMMARY: As part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection (CBP) invites the general public and other Federal agencies to comment on an information collection requirement concerning the Protest. This request for comment is being made pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104–13; 44 U.S.C. 3505(c)(2)).

DATES: Written comments should be received on or before June 12, 2006, to be assured of consideration.

ADDRESSES: Direct all written comments to the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection, Information Services Group, Room 3.2.C, 1300 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20229.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Requests for additional information should be directed to Bureau of Customs and Border Protection, Attn.: Tracey Denning, Room 3.2.C, 1300 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20229, Tel. (202) 344–1429.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: CBP invites the general public and other Federal agencies to comment on proposed and/or continuing information collections pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104–13; 44 U.S.C. 3505(c)(2)). The comments should address: (a) Whether the collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency’s estimates of the burden of the collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; (d) ways to minimize the burden including the use of automated collection techniques or the use of other forms of information technology; and (e) estimates of capital or start-up costs and costs of operations, maintenance, and