

exhibits an amplification ratio of less than 1 in human cell lines, such as 293 (ECACC No. 85120602), 143B (ECACC No. 91112502), HeLa (ATCC No. CCL-2) and HaCat (Boukamp *et al.* 1988, J Cell Biol 106(3): 761–71) under the conditions outlined in Example 1 of the present specification”? ’752 patent, col. 2, lines 53–59.

(2) Would a virus be considered to replicate if it sometimes replicated and other times did not? Is a person of ordinary skill in the art only concerned with mean values to the exclusion of standard error analysis? Would a person of ordinary skill in the art find viral replication if the mean value were above 1 even if the confidence intervals straddled 1? Would a person of ordinary skill in the art find no replication if the mean value were below 1 and the confidence intervals straddled 1?

(3) Is there evidence that MVA–575 possesses a replication ratio of 1 or greater in HaCaT and other human cells? Is there clear and convincing evidence that MVA–575 possesses a replication ratio less than 1 in HaCaT and other human cells?

(4) Given the claim construction in Order No. 31 regarding “replication,” would it matter to enablement, written description, infringement, or domestic industry of the ’752 patent whether MVA–BN replicated less than MVA–575 if MVA–575 still possessed a replication ratio less than 1 in human cells? Is the ALJ’s claim construction of this term correct to a person of ordinary skill in the art? Answers to the above should give precise citations to the record and should take into account the confidence interval.

(5) Figure 1A indicates that the replication rates for certain MVA viruses are different. This is especially apparent at higher replication rates. Does the difference in replication rates indicate that these viruses are not identical? Would the lack of identity be reflected in the genome? If so, what part of the genome would reflect the lack of identity? The coding region? The noncoding region? Both?

In connection with the final disposition of this investigation, the Commission may issue (1) An order that could result in the exclusion of the subject articles from entry into the United States, and/or (2) cease and desist orders that could result in respondents being required to cease and desist from engaging in unfair acts in the importation and sale of such articles. Accordingly, the Commission is interested in receiving written submissions that address the form of remedy, if any, that should be ordered. If a party seeks exclusion of an article from entry into the United States for purposes other than entry for consumption, the party should so indicate and provide information establishing that activities involving other types of entry either are adversely affecting it or are likely to do so. For background information, see the Commission Opinion, *In the Matter of Certain Devices for Connecting*

Computers via Telephone Lines, Inv. No. 337–TA–360.

If the Commission contemplates some form of remedy, it must consider the effects of that remedy upon the public interest. The factors the Commission will consider include the effect that an exclusion order and/or cease and desist orders would have on (1) The public health and welfare, (2) competitive conditions in the U.S. economy, (3) U.S. production of articles that are like or directly competitive with those that are subject to investigation, and (4) U.S. consumers. The Commission is therefore interested in receiving written submissions that address the aforementioned public interest factors in the context of this investigation.

If the Commission orders some form of remedy, the President has 60 days to approve or disapprove the Commission’s action. During this period, the subject articles would be entitled to enter the United States under a bond, in an amount to be determined by the Commission and prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury. The Commission is therefore interested in receiving submissions concerning the amount of the bond that should be imposed.

Written Submissions: The parties to the investigation are requested to file written submissions on the issues under review. The submissions should be concise and thoroughly referenced to the record in this investigation, including references to exhibits and testimony. Additionally, the parties to the investigation, interested government agencies, and any other interested persons are encouraged to file written submissions on the issues of remedy, the public interest, and bonding. Such submissions should address the ALJ’s September 6, 2006, recommended determination on remedy and bonding. Complainant and the Commission investigative attorney are also requested to submit proposed remedial orders for the Commission’s consideration. Complainant is requested to supply the expiration dates of the patents at issue and the HTSUS numbers under which the accused products are imported. The written submissions and proposed remedial orders must be filed no later than the close of business on December 12, 2006. Reply submissions must be filed no later than the close of business on December 22, 2006. No further submissions will be permitted unless otherwise ordered by the Commission.

Persons filing written submissions must file with the Office of the Secretary the original and 12 true copies thereof on or before the deadlines stated above. Any person desiring to submit a

document (or portion thereof) to the Commission in confidence must request confidential treatment unless the information has already been granted such treatment during the proceedings. All such requests should be directed to the Secretary of the Commission and must include a full statement of the reasons why the Commission should grant such treatment. See 19 CFR 201.6. Documents for which confidential treatment is granted by the Commission will be treated accordingly. All nonconfidential written submissions will be available for public inspection at the Office of the Secretary.

This action is taken under the authority of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1337), and under sections 210.42–.46, .51(a) of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 210.42–.46, .51(a)).

By order of the Commission.

Issued: November 22, 2006.

Marilyn R. Abbott,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. E6–20178 Filed 11–28–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

[OMB Number 1105–0071]

National Drug Intelligence Center; Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Reinstatement With Change of a Previously Approved Collection; Comments Requested

ACTION: 30-Day Notice of Information Collection Under Review: Reinstatement with Change of a Previously Approved Collection National Drug Threat Survey.

The United States Department of Justice (DOJ), National Drug Intelligence Center (NDIC), has submitted the following information collection request to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. The proposed information collection is published to obtain comments from the public and affected agencies. This proposed information collection was previously published in the **Federal Register** Volume 71, Number 187, page 56552 on September 27, 2006, allowing for a 60 day comment period.

The purpose of this notice is to allow for an additional 30 days for public comment until December 29, 2006. This process is conducted in accordance with 5 CFR 1320.10.

Written comments and/or suggestions regarding the items contained in this notice, especially the estimated public

burden and associated response time, should be directed to the Office of Management and Budget, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attention Department of Justice Desk Officer, Washington, DC 20503. Additionally, comments may be submitted to OMB via facsimile to (202) 395-5806. Written comments and suggestions from the public and affected agencies concerning the proposed collection of information are encouraged. Your comments should address one or more of the following four points:

- Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;
- Evaluate the accuracy of the agencies estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;
- Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and
- Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, *e.g.*, permitting electronic submission of responses.

Overview of this Information Collection

(1) *Type of Information Collection:* Extension Reinstatement with Change of a Previously Approved Collection.

(2) *Title of the Form/Collection:* National Drug Threat Survey.

(3) *Agency form number, if any, and the applicable component of the Department of Justice sponsoring the collection:* Form Number: NDIC Form # A-34g.

(4) *Affected public who will be asked or required to respond, as well as a brief abstract:* Primary: Federal, State, and Local, law enforcement agencies. This survey is a critical component of the National Drug Threat Assessment and other reports and assessments produced by the National Drug Intelligence Center. It provides direct access to detailed drug threat data from State and local law enforcement agencies.

(5) *An estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time estimated for an average respondent to respond:* It is estimated that approximately 3,500 respondents will complete a survey response within approximately 20 minutes.

(6) *An estimate of the total public burden (in hours) associated with the collection:* There are an estimated 1,167 total annual burden hours associated with this collection.

If additional information is required contact: Ms. Lynn Bryant, Department Clearance Officer, United States Department of Justice, Justice Management Division, Policy and Planning Staff, Patrick Henry Building, Suite 1600, 601 D Street, NW., Washington, DC 20530.

Dated: November 22, 2006.

Lynn Bryant,

Department Clearance Officer, Department of Justice.

[FR Doc. E6-20222 Filed 11-28-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-DC-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

[OMB Number 1122-0006]

Office on Violence Against Women; Agency Information Collection Activities: Revision of a Currently Approved Collection; Comments Requested

ACTION: 30-Day Notice of Information Collection Under Review: Semi-Annual Progress Report for the Grants to Encourage Arrest Policies and Enforcement of Protection Orders Program.

The Department of Justice, Office on Violence Against Women (OVW) has submitted the following information collection request to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. The proposed information collection is published to obtain comments from the public and affected agencies. This proposed information collection was previously published in the **Federal Register** Volume 71, Number 185, pages 55805-55806 on September 25, 2006, allowing for a 60-day comment period.

The purpose of this notice is to allow for an additional 30 days for public comment until December 29, 2006. This process is conducted in accordance with 5 CFR 1320.10.

Written comments and/or suggestions regarding the items contained in this notice, especially the estimated public burden and associated response time, should be directed to The Office of Management and Budget, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attention Department of Justice Desk Officer, Washington, DC 20503. Additionally, comments may be submitted to OMB via facsimile to (202) 395-5806.

Written comments and suggestions from the public and affected agencies concerning the proposed collection of information are encouraged. Your comments should address one or more of the following four points:

(1) Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;

(2) Evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

(3) Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and

(4) Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, *e.g.*, permitting electronic submission of responses.

Overview of This Information Collection

(1) *Type of Information Collection:* Revision of a currently approved collection.

(2) *Title of the Form/Collection:* Semi-Annual Progress Report for Grants to Encourage Arrest Policies and Enforcement of Protection Orders Program.

(3) *Agency form number, if any, and the applicable component of the Department of Justice sponsoring the collection:* Form Number: 1122-0006. U.S. Department of Justice, Office on Violence Against Women.

(4) *Affected public who will be asked or required to respond, as well as a brief abstract:* The affected public includes the approximately 200 grantees of the Grants to Encourage Arrest Policies and Enforcement of Protection Orders Program (Arrest Program) whose eligibility is determined by statute. The Arrest Program was authorized through the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) and reauthorized and amended by the Violence Against Women Act of 2000 (VAWA 2000) and by the Violence Against Women Act of 2005 (VAWA 2005). The Arrest Program promotes mandatory or pro-arrest policies and encourages jurisdictions to treat domestic violence and sexual assault as a serious crime, establish coordinated community responses and facilitate the enforcement of protection orders. By statute, eligible grantees for the Arrest Program are States, Indian tribal