is accurate, and based on valid assumptions and methodology: ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and ways in which we can minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, through the use of appropriate technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Obtaining Copies of Proposals:
Requesters may obtain a copy of the information collection documents from the General Services Administration, Regulatory Secretariat (MVCB), 1800 F Street NW., Washington, DC 20405, telephone 202–501–4755. Please cite OMB Control Number 9000–0007, Summary Subcontract Report, in all correspondence.

Edward Loeb,
Acting Director, Federal Acquisition Policy Division, Office of Governmentwide Acquisition Policy, Office of Acquisition Policy. Office of Governmentwide Policy.

[FR Doc. 2015–27553 Filed 10–28–15; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6820–EP–P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION
NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

[OMB Control No. 9000–0189; Docket No. 2015–0055; Sequence 52]

Submission for OMB Review; Identification of Predecessors

AGENCY: Department of Defense (DOD), General Services Administration (GSA), and National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA).

ACTION: Notice of request for public comments regarding a new OMB clearance.

SUMMARY: Under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act, the Regulatory Secretariat Division will be submitting to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) a request to review and approve a new information collection requirement concerning Identification of Predecessors. A notice was published in the Federal Register at 79 FR 71973, on December 4, 2014. Two comments were received.

DATES: Submit comments on or before November 30, 2015.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments regarding this burden estimator or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden to: Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs of OMB, Attention: Desk Officer for GSA, Room 10236, NEOB, Washington, DC 20503. Additionally submit a copy to GSA by any of the following methods:

- Regulations.gov: http://www.regulations.gov. Submit comments via the Federal eRulemaking portal by searching for OMB control number 9000–0189, Identification of Predecessors. Select the link “Submit a Comment” that corresponds with “9000–0189; Identification of Predecessors.” Follow the instructions provided at the “Submit a Comment” screen. Please include your name, company name (if any), and “9000–0189; Identification of Predecessors” on your attached document.


Instructions: Please submit comments only and cite Information Collection 9000–0189, in all correspondence related to this case. Comments received generally will be posted without change to http://www.regulations.gov, including any personal and/or business confidential information provided. To confirm receipt of your comment(s), please check www.regulations.gov, approximately two to three days after submission to verify posting (except allow 30 days for posting of comments submitted by mail).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Cecelia L. Davis, Procurement Analyst, Federal Acquisition Policy Division, at 202–219–0202 or email cecelia.davis@gsa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

A. Purpose

This final rule implements section 852 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 to include in the Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIIS), to the extent practicable, identification of any immediate owner or subsidiary, and all predecessors of an offeror that held a Federal contract or grant within the last three years. The objective is to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the performance and integrity of the corporation before awarding a Federal contract.

B. Discussion and Analysis

The Civilian Agency Acquisition Council and the Defense Acquisition Regulations Council (the Councils) reviewed the comments in the development of the final rule. A discussion of the comments is provided as follows:

A. Summary of Significant Changes in Response to Public Comments

There were no changes made in the final rule in response to the public comments received.

B. Analysis of Public Comments

Comment: One respondent commented that it would be helpful if the relevant FAR provisions and FAR clause 52.204–WW clarified whether the three year “lookback” period starts on the effective date of when the predecessor merged or was acquired by the successor or the date the contracts of the predecessor were novated from the predecessor to the successor.

Response: The “lookback” period starts on the date the offeror signs the representation. If, within the three years prior to signing the representation, there was a merger or acquisition, it shall be reported. The date of novation is not relevant for purposes of this rule.

Comment: One respondent supported the statute because it requires that information be provided to the contracting officers to aid in making responsibility determinations, and supported the position that the “the further the distance between entities, the less relevant the information is likely to be for establishing responsibility of the offeror.”

Response: Noted.

Comment: One respondent commented that the proposed rule’s requirement to report data on all predecessors of the offeror that received a Federal contract or grant within the last three years would apply an undue burden on prospective contractors and not achieve the Government’s stated objective of providing a more comprehensive understanding of a potential contractor’s performance and integrity. The respondent proposed that publicly traded companies subject to SEC requirements be exempt from this requirement because it instills a burden without benefit to the Government.

Response: The statute does not allow for this exemption.

Comment: One respondent commented that large multi-national organizations many times reorganize business units in order to effectively respond to changing needs of the marketplace. These reorganizations can include alternate legal structures. The respondent proposed that where the ultimate owner remains the same before
and after a transaction, the contractor be exempted from providing information on predecessor entities. According to the respondent, this is consistent with the Government’s exclusion of a “new offices/divisions of the same company’’ from the definition of “successor.”

Response: This recommendation does not meet the requirements of the statute.

Comment: One respondent commented that contracting officers and their counsel perform a rigorous review and analysis to deal with the novation process and feels that there should be no requirement to identify prior owners within the FAPIS because the required responsibility determination would have been conducted through novation.

Response: The statute requires collection of information on predecessor, regardless of any novation action by the Government.

Comment: The respondent commented that the reporting of the ultimate owners became effective on November 1, 2014, and believe that agencies should allow contractors and contracting officers time to implement and evaluate the results of this new requirement before adding more requirements that may not aid contracting officers in responsibility and integrity evaluations.

Response: The statute does not allow the Government to delay the implementation of this Act.

Comments: The respondent feels that commercially available off-the-shelf (COTS) items should be excluded from this requirement.

Response: The Administrator of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy has determined that this rule applies to COTS items.

C. Annual Reporting Burden

Respondents: 413,800.
Responses per Respondent: 1.
Total Annual Responses: 413,800.
Hours per Response: 1.
Total Burden Hours: 41,380.

Public comments are particularly invited on: Whether this collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of functions of the FAR, and whether it will have practical utility; whether our estimate of the public burden of this collection of information is accurate, and based on valid assumptions and methodology; ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and ways in which we can minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, through the use of appropriate technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality

Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; Comment Request

AGENCY: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, HHS.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This notice announces the intention of the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) to request that the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) approve the proposed information collection project: “Online Application Order Form for Products From the Healthcare Cost and Utilization Project (HCUP).” In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act, 44 U.S.C. 3501–3521, AHRQ invites the public to comment on this proposed information collection.

This proposed information collection was previously published in the Federal Register on August 20, 2015 and allowed 60 days for public comment. No substantive comments were received. The purpose of this notice is to allow an additional 30 days for public comment.

DATES: Comments on this notice must be received by November 30, 2015.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be submitted to: AHRQ’s OMB Desk Officer by fax at (202) 395–6974 (attention: AHRQ’s desk officer) or by email at OIRA_submission@omb.eop.gov (attention: AHRQ’s desk officer). Copies of the proposed collection plans, data collection instruments, and specific details on the estimated burden can be obtained from the AHRQ Reports Clearance Officer.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Doris Lefkowitz, AHRQ Reports Clearance Officer, (301) 427–1477, or by email at doris.lefkowitz@AHRQ.hhs.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Proposed Project
Online Application Order Form for Products From the Healthcare Cost and Utilization Project (HCUP)

The Healthcare Cost and Utilization Project (HCUP) is a vital resource helping the Agency achieve its mission to produce evidence to make health care safer, higher quality, more accessible, equitable, and affordable. HCUP is a family of health care databases and related software tools and products developed through a Federal-State-Industry partnership and sponsored by AHRQ. HCUP includes the largest collection of longitudinal hospital care data in the United States, with all-payer, encounter-level information beginning in 1988. The HCUP databases are annual files that contain anonymous information from hospital discharge records for inpatient care and certain components of outpatient care, such as emergency care and ambulatory surgeries. The project currently releases seven types of databases created for research use on a broad range of health issues, including cost and quality of health services, medical practice patterns, access to health care programs, and outcomes of treatments at the National, State, and local market levels. HCUP also produces a large number of software tools to enhance the use of administrative health care data for research and public health use. Software tools use information available from a variety of sources to create new data elements, often through sophisticated algorithms, for use with the HCUP databases.

HCUP’s objectives are to:
• Create and enhance a powerful source of National, State, and all-payer health care data.
• Produce a broad set of software tools and products to facilitate the use of HCUP and other administrative data.
• Enrich a collaborative partnership with statewide data organizations (that voluntarily participate in the project) aimed at increasing the quality and use of health care data.
• Conduct and translate research to inform decision making and improve health care delivery.

This project is being conducted by AHRQ through its primary contractor and subcontractor, Truven Health Analytics and Social & Scientific Systems, Inc., pursuant to AHRQ’s statutory authority to conduct and support research on health care and on systems for the delivery of such care,