

requirements and follow best practices for protecting confidentiality, personal privacy, proprietary interests, intellectual property rights, author attribution, and for ensuring that homeland and national security interests are not compromised.

The Working Group is now seeking additional insight from “non-Federal stakeholders, including the public, universities, nonprofit and for-profit publishers, libraries, federally funded and non-federally funded research scientists, and other organizations and institutions with an interest in long-term stewardship and improved public access to the results of federally funded research,” as described in Section 103(b)(6) of ACRA. Specifically the Working Group seeks further public comment on the questions listed below:

*Preservation, Discoverability, and Access*

(1) What specific Federal policies would encourage public access to and the preservation of broadly valuable digital data resulting from federally funded scientific research, to grow the U.S. economy and improve the productivity of the American scientific enterprise?

(2) What specific steps can be taken to protect the intellectual property interests of publishers, scientists, Federal agencies, and other stakeholders, with respect to any existing or proposed policies for encouraging public access to and preservation of digital data resulting from federally funded scientific research?

(3) How could Federal agencies take into account inherent differences between scientific disciplines and different types of digital data when developing policies on the management of data?

(4) How could agency policies consider differences in the relative costs and benefits of long-term stewardship and dissemination of different types of data resulting from federally funded research?

(5) How can stakeholders (e.g., research communities, universities, research institutions, libraries, scientific publishers) best contribute to the implementation of data management plans?

(6) How could funding mechanisms be improved to better address the real costs of preserving and making digital data accessible?

(7) What approaches could agencies take to measure, verify, and improve compliance with Federal data stewardship and access policies for scientific research? How can the burden

of compliance and verification be minimized?

(8) What additional steps could agencies take to stimulate innovative use of publicly accessible research data in new and existing markets and industries to create jobs and grow the economy?

(9) What mechanisms could be developed to assure that those who produced the data are given appropriate attribution and credit when secondary results are reported?

*Standards for Interoperability, Re-Use and Re-Purposing*

(10) What digital data standards would enable interoperability, reuse, and repurposing of digital scientific data? For example, MIAME (minimum information about a microarray experiment; see Brazma et al., 2001, *Nature Genetics* 29, 371) is an example of a community-driven data standards effort.

(11) What are other examples of standards development processes that were successful in producing effective standards and what characteristics of the process made these efforts successful?

(12) How could Federal agencies promote effective coordination on digital data standards with other nations and international communities?

(13) What policies, practices, and standards are needed to support linking between publications and associated data?

Response to this RFI is voluntary. Responders are free to address any or all the above items, as well as provide additional information that they think is relevant to developing policies consistent with increased preservation and dissemination of broadly useful digital data resulting from federally funded research. Please note that the Government will not pay for response preparation or for the use of any information contained in the response.

**How To Submit a Response**

All comments must be submitted electronically to: [digitaldata@ostp.gov](mailto:digitaldata@ostp.gov).

Responses to this RFI will be accepted through January 12, 2012. You will receive an electronic confirmation acknowledging receipt of your response, but will not receive individualized feedback on any suggestions. No basis for claims against the U.S. Government shall arise as a result of a response to this request for information or from the Government's use of such information.

**Inquiries**

Specific questions about this RFI should be directed to the following email address: [digitaldata@ostp.gov](mailto:digitaldata@ostp.gov).

Form should include:

[Assigned ID #]  
[Assigned Entry date]  
Name/Email  
Affiliation/Organization  
City, State  
Comment 1  
Comment 2  
Comment 3  
Comment 4,  
Comment 5  
Comment 6  
Comment 7  
Comment 8  
Comment 9  
Comment 10  
Comment 11

In addition, please identify any other items the Working Group might consider for Federal policies related to public access to peer-reviewed scholarly publications resulting from federally supported research.

Please attach any documents that support your comments to the questions.

**Ted Wackler,**

*Deputy Chief of Staff.*

[FR Doc. 2011-28621 Filed 11-3-11; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE P**

**OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY**

**Request for Information: Public Access to Peer-Reviewed Scholarly Publications Resulting From Federally Funded Research**

**ACTION:** Notice of Request for Information (RFI).

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with Section 103(b)(6) of the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2010 (ACRA; Pub. L. 111-358), this Request for Information (RFI) offers the opportunity for interested individuals and organizations to provide recommendations on approaches for ensuring long-term stewardship and broad public access to the peer-reviewed scholarly publications that result from federally funded scientific research. The public input provided through this Notice will inform deliberations of the National Science and Technology Council's Task Force on Public Access to Scholarly Publications.

*Release Date:* November 3, 2011.

*Response Date:* January 2, 2012.

**ADDRESSES:** [publicaccess@ostp.gov](mailto:publicaccess@ostp.gov).

**Issued By**

Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) on behalf of the National Science and Technology Council (NSTC).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:****Purpose**

In accordance with Section 103(b)(6) of the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2010 (ACRA; Pub. L. 111-358), this Request for Information (RFI) offers the opportunity for interested individuals and organizations to provide recommendations on approaches for ensuring long-term stewardship and broad public access to the peer-reviewed scholarly publications that result from federally funded scientific research. The public input provided through this Notice will inform deliberations of the National Science and Technology Council's Task Force on Public Access to Scholarly Publications.

**Background**

The multi-agency Task Force on Public Access to Scholarly Publications (Task Force), established under the National Science and Technology Council (NSTC) Committee on Science (CoS), has been tasked with developing options for implementing the scholarly publications requirements of Section 103 of ACRA. OSTP will issue a report to Congress, in accordance with Section 103(e) of ACRA, describing priorities for the development of agency policies for ensuring broad public access to the results of federally funded unclassified research, the status of agency policies for public access to publications resulting from federally funded research, and a summary of public input collected from this RFI and other mechanisms.

In 2009 and 2010, OSTP conducted a public consultation about policy options for expanding public access to federally funded peer-reviewed scholarly articles. The Task Force has reviewed the information submitted through OSTP's public consultation (the full set of comments can be viewed on the OSTP Web site [<http://www.whitehouse.gov/blog/2010/03/08/public-access-policy-update>]), experience with the various policies currently in use at a variety of Federal agencies, and a report from the congressionally convened Scholarly Publishing Roundtable (<http://www.aau.edu/WorkArea/showcontent.aspx?id=10044>). The Task Force is now seeking additional insight from "non-Federal stakeholders, including the public, universities,

nonprofit and for-profit publishers, libraries, federally funded and non-federally funded research scientists, and other organizations and institutions with a stake in long-term preservation and access to the results of federally funded research," as described in Section 103(b)(6) of the ACRA. Specifically, OSTP seeks further public comment on the questions listed below, on behalf of the Task Force:

(1) Are there steps that agencies could take to grow existing and new markets related to the access and analysis of peer-reviewed publications that result from federally funded scientific research? How can policies for archiving publications and making them publically accessible be used to grow the economy and improve the productivity of the scientific enterprise? What are the relative costs and benefits of such policies? What type of access to these publications is required to maximize U.S. economic growth and improve the productivity of the American scientific enterprise?

(2) What specific steps can be taken to protect the intellectual property interests of publishers, scientists, Federal agencies, and other stakeholders involved with the publication and dissemination of peer-reviewed scholarly publications resulting from federally funded scientific research? Conversely, are there policies that should not be adopted with respect to public access to peer-reviewed scholarly publications so as not to undermine any intellectual property rights of publishers, scientists, Federal agencies, and other stakeholders?

(3) What are the pros and cons of centralized and decentralized approaches to managing public access to peer-reviewed scholarly publications that result from federally funded research in terms of interoperability, search, development of analytic tools, and other scientific and commercial opportunities? Are there reasons why a Federal agency (or agencies) should maintain custody of all published content, and are there ways that the government can ensure long-term stewardship if content is distributed across multiple private sources?

(4) Are there models or new ideas for public-private partnerships that take advantage of existing publisher archives and encourage innovation in accessibility and interoperability, while ensuring long-term stewardship of the results of federally funded research?

(5) What steps can be taken by Federal agencies, publishers, and/or scholarly and professional societies to encourage interoperable search, discovery, and analysis capacity across disciplines and

archives? What are the minimum core metadata for scholarly publications that must be made available to the public to allow such capabilities? How should Federal agencies make certain that such minimum core metadata associated with peer-reviewed publications resulting from federally funded scientific research are publicly available to ensure that these publications can be easily found and linked to Federal science funding?

(6) How can Federal agencies that fund science maximize the benefit of public access policies to U.S. taxpayers, and their investment in the peer-reviewed literature, while minimizing burden and costs for stakeholders, including awardee institutions, scientists, publishers, Federal agencies, and libraries?

(7) Besides scholarly journal articles, should other types of peer-reviewed publications resulting from federally funded research, such as book chapters and conference proceedings, be covered by these public access policies?

(8) What is the appropriate embargo period after publication before the public is granted free access to the full content of peer-reviewed scholarly publications resulting from federally funded research? Please describe the empirical basis for the recommended embargo period. Analyses that weigh public and private benefits and account for external market factors, such as competition, price changes, library budgets, and other factors, will be particularly useful. Are there evidence-based arguments that can be made that the delay period should be different for specific disciplines or types of publications?

Please identify any other items the Task Force might consider for Federal policies related to public access to peer-reviewed scholarly publications resulting from federally supported research.

Response to this RFI is voluntary. Responders are free to address any or all the above items, as well as provide additional information that they think is relevant to developing policies consistent with increased public access to peer-reviewed scholarly publications resulting from federally funded research. Please note that the U.S. Government will not pay for response preparation or for the use of any information contained in the response.

**How To Submit a Response**

All comments must be submitted electronically to: [publicaccess@ostp.gov](mailto:publicaccess@ostp.gov). Responses to this RFI will be accepted through January 2, 2012. You will receive an electronic confirmation acknowledging receipt of your response,

but will not receive individualized feedback on any suggestions. No basis for claims against the U.S. Government shall arise as a result of a response to this request for information or from the Government's use of such information.

#### Inquiries

Specific questions about this RFI should be directed to the following email address: [publicaccess@ostp.gov](mailto:publicaccess@ostp.gov).

Form should include:

[Assigned ID #]  
[Assigned Entry date]  
Name/Email  
Affiliation/Organization  
City, State  
Comment 1  
Comment 2  
Comment 3  
Comment 4  
Comment 5  
Comment 6  
Comment 7  
Comment 8

Please identify any other items the Task Force might consider for Federal policies related to public access to peer-reviewed scholarly publications resulting from federally supported research.

{Attachment is: Please attach any documents that support your comments to the questions.}

**Ted Wackler,**  
*Deputy Chief of Staff.*

[FR Doc. 2011-28623 Filed 11-3-11; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE P**

## SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. IC-29853]

### Notice of Applications for Deregistration Under Section 8(f) of the Investment Company Act of 1940

October 28, 2011.

The following is a notice of applications for deregistration under section 8(f) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 for the month of October, 2011. A copy of each application may be obtained via the Commission's Web site by searching for the file number, or an applicant using the Company name box, at <http://www.sec.gov/search/search.htm> or by calling (202) 551-8090. An order granting each application will be issued unless the SEC orders a hearing. Interested persons may request a hearing on any application by writing to the SEC's Secretary at the address below and serving the relevant applicant with a copy of the request, personally or by

mail. Hearing requests should be received by the SEC by 5:30 p.m. on November 25, 2011, and should be accompanied by proof of service on the applicant, in the form of an affidavit or, for lawyers, a certificate of service. Hearing requests should state the nature of the writer's interest, the reason for the request, and the issues contested. Persons who wish to be notified of a hearing may request notification by writing to the Secretary, U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission, 100 F Street NE., Washington, DC 20549-1090.

*For Further Information Contact:*  
Diane L. Titus at (202) 551-6810, SEC, Division of Investment Management, Office of Investment Company Regulation, 100 F Street NE., Washington, DC 20549-8010.

#### Keystone America Capital Preservation and Income Fund [File No. 811-6237]

*Summary:* Applicant seeks an order declaring that it has ceased to be an investment company. On or about December 30, 1994, applicant transferred its assets to Keystone Capital Preservation and Income Fund, based on net asset value. Records listing the expenses incurred in connection with the reorganization are no longer available.

*Filing Date:* The application was filed on October 5, 2011.

*Applicant's Address:* 200 Berkeley St., Boston, MA 02116.

#### Keystone Australia Funds Inc. [File No. 811-5832]

*Summary:* Applicant seeks an order declaring that it has ceased to be an investment company. On or about December 30, 1994, applicant transferred its assets to Keystone World Bond Fund, then known as Keystone America World Bond Fund, based on net asset value. Records listing the expenses incurred in connection with the reorganization are no longer available.

*Filing Date:* The application was filed on September 27, 2011.

*Applicant's Address:* 200 Berkeley St., Boston, MA 02116.

#### Global Real Estate Investments Fund [File No. 811-22322]

*Summary:* Applicant seeks an order declaring that it has ceased to be an investment company. On July 29, 2011, applicant transferred its assets to James Alpha Global Real Estate Investments Portfolios, a series of Saratoga Advantage Trust, based on net asset value. Expenses of \$80,330 incurred in connection with the reorganization were paid by Ascent Investment Advisors, LLC, applicant's investment adviser.

*Filing Date:* The application was filed on September 27, 2011.

*Applicant's Address:* Ascent Investment Advisors, LLC, 5251 DTC Parkway #935, Greenwood Village, CO 80111.

For the Commission, by the Division of Investment Management, pursuant to delegated authority.

**Kevin M. O'Neill,**  
*Deputy Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 2011-28585 Filed 11-3-11; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 8011-01-P**

## SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34-65660; File Nos. SR-EDGA-2011-29; SR-EDGX-2011-28]

### Self-Regulatory Organizations; EDGA Exchange, Inc.; EDGX Exchange, Inc.; Notice of Designation of Longer Period for Commission Action on Proposed Rule Changes Relating to Amendments to EDGA and EDGX Rules Regarding the Registration and Obligations of Market Makers

October 31, 2011.

On August 30, 2011, EDGA Exchange, Inc. and EDGX Exchange, Inc. ("EDGA" and "EDGX," or "Exchanges") filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission ("Commission"), pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 ("Act"),<sup>1</sup> and Rule 19b-4 thereunder,<sup>2</sup> proposed rule changes relating to amendments to EDGA and EDGX rules regarding the registration and obligations of market makers. The proposed rule changes were published for comment in the **Federal Register** on September 16, 2011.<sup>3</sup>

Section 19(b)(2) of the Act<sup>4</sup> provides that, within forty-five days of the publication of notice of the filing of a proposed rule change, or within such longer period as the Commission may designate up to ninety days of such date if it finds such longer period to be appropriate and publishes its reasons for so finding, the Commission shall either approve or disapprove the proposed rule change or institute proceedings to determine whether the proposed rule change should be disapproved. The 45th day for these filings is October 31, 2011.

<sup>1</sup> 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

<sup>2</sup> 17 CFR 240.19b-4.

<sup>3</sup> See Securities Exchange Act Release No. 65315 (September 12, 2011), 76 FR 57772 (September 16, 2011) (SR-EDGX-2011-28); Securities Exchange Act Release No. 65316 (September 12, 2011), 76 FR 57787 (SR-EDGA-2011-29).

<sup>4</sup> 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(2).