Substances Act (CSA), “upon a finding that the registrant . . . has had his State license . . . suspended [or] revoked . . . by competent State authority and is no longer authorized by State law to engage in the . . . dispensing of controlled substances.” Also, DEA has long held that the possession of authority to dispense controlled substances under the laws of the State in which a practitioner engages in professional practice is a fundamental condition for obtaining and maintaining a practitioner's registration. See, e.g., James L. Hooper, 76 FR 71371 (2011), pet. for rev. denied, 481 Fed. Appx. 826 (4th Cir. 2012); see also Frederick Marsh Blanton, 43 FR 27616 (1978) (“State authorization to dispense or otherwise handle controlled substances is a prerequisite to the issuance and maintenance of a Federal controlled substances registration.”). This rule derives from the text of two provisions of the Controlled Substances Act (CSA). First, Congress defined “the term ‘practitioner’ [to] mean[a . . . physician . . . or other person licensed, registered or otherwise permitted, by . . . the jurisdiction in which he practices . . . to distribute, dispense, [or] administer . . . a controlled substance in the course of professional practice.” 21 U.S.C. 802(1). Second, in setting the requirements for obtaining a practitioner’s registration, Congress directed that “[t]he Attorney General shall register practitioners . . . if the applicant is authorized to dispense . . . controlled substances under the laws of the State in which he practices.” 21 U.S.C. 823(f).

Moreover, because “the controlling question” in a proceeding brought under 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(3) is whether the holder of a DEA registration “is currently authorized to handle controlled substances in the [S]tate,” Hooper, 76 FR at 71371 (quoting Anne Lazar Thorn, 62 FR 12847, 12848 (1997)), the Agency has also long held that revocation is warranted even where a practitioner has lost his state authority by virtue of the State’s use of summary process and the State has yet to provide a hearing to challenge the suspension. Bourne Pharmacy, 72 FR 18273, 18274 (2007); Wingfield Drugs, 52 FR 27070, 27071 (1987). Thus, for the purposes of the CSA, it is of no consequence that the Wyoming Medical Board has employed summary process in suspending Registrant’s state license.

As found above, on November 29, 2016, the Wyoming Board of Medicine ordered the summary suspension of Registrant’s Physician License effective the same day, thereby suspending “his authority and ability to practice medicine in the state of Wyoming.” GX 3, at 18. I therefore find that Registrant lacks authority to dispense controlled substances in Wyoming, the State in which he is registered with the Agency and that he is not entitled to maintain his registration. See Hooper, 76 FR at 71371; Blanton, 43 FR 27616. Accordingly, I will order that his registration be revoked. 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(3).

Order
Pursuant to the authority vested in me by 21 U.S.C. 824(a), as well as 28 CFR 0.100(b), I order that DEA Certificate of Registration No. FK5578464 issued to Shakeel A. Kahn, M.D., be, and it hereby is, revoked. I further order that any application of Shakeel A. Khan, M.D., to renew or modify this registration, be, and it hereby is, denied. This Order is effective immediately.¹


Chuck Rosenberg,
Acting Administrator.

¹ For the same reasons that led the Wyoming Board to summarily suspend Registrant’s medical license, I find that the public interest necessitates that this order be effective immediately. 21 CFR 1316.67.
enforcement, taxation, regulatory, or any other non-statistical use and immunize the information submitted to statistical agencies from legal process. Moreover, many of these statutes carry monetary fines and/or criminal penalties for conviction of a knowing and willful unauthorized disclosure of covered information. Any person violating the confidentiality provisions of 42 U.S.C. § 3789g may be punished by a fine of up to $10,000, in addition to any other penalties imposed by law.

As part of the Consolidated Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Pub. L. No. 114–113) signed on December 17, 2015, the Congress included the Federal Cybersecurity Enhancement Act of 2015 (codified in relevant part at 6 U.S.C. § 151). This act, among other provisions, permits and requires the Secretary of Homeland Security to provide federal civilian agencies’ information technology systems with cybersecurity protection for their Internet traffic. The technology currently used to provide this protection against cyber malware is known as Einstein 3A. Einstein 3A electronically searches Internet traffic in and out of federal civilian agencies in real time for malware signatures.

When such a signature is found, the internet packets that contain the malware signature are shunted aside for further inspection by DHS personnel. Because it is possible that such packets entering or leaving a statistical agency’s information technology system may contain a small portion of confidential statistical data, statistical agencies can no longer promise their respondents that their responses will be seen only by statistical agency personnel or their agents. However, federal statistical agencies can promise, in accordance with provisions of the Federal Cybersecurity Enhancement Act of 2015, that such monitoring can be used only to protect information and information systems from cybersecurity risks, thereby, in effect, providing stronger protection to the integrity of the respondents’ submissions.

Consequently, with the passage of the Federal Cybersecurity Enhancement Act of 2015, the federal statistical community has an opportunity to welcome the further protection of its confidential data offered by DHS’ Einstein 3A cybersecurity protection program. The DHS cybersecurity program’s objective is to protect federal civilian information systems from malicious malware attacks. The federal statistical system’s objective is to endeavor to ensure that the DHS Secretary performs those essential duties in a manner that honors the statistical agencies’ statutory promises to the public to protect their confidential data. DHS and the federal statistical system have been successfully engaged in finding a way to balance both objectives and achieve these mutually reinforcing objectives.

However, pledges of confidentiality made pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 3789g and similar statutes assure respondents that their data will be seen only by statistical agency personnel or their agents. Because it is possible that DHS personnel could see some portion of those confidential data in the course of examining the suspicious Internet packets identified by Einstein 3A sensors, statistical agencies are revising their confidentiality pledges to reflect this process change. Therefore, BJS is providing this notice to alert the public to these confidentiality pledge revisions in an efficient and coordinated fashion.

II. Method of Collection

The following is the revised statistical confidentiality pledge for applicable BJS data collections, with the new line added to address the new cybersecurity monitoring activities bolded for reference only:

“The Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) is authorized to conduct this data collection under 42 U.S.C. § 3732. BJS is dedicated to maintaining the confidentiality of your personally identifiable information, and will protect it to the fullest extent under federal law. BJS, BJS employees, and BJS data collection agents will use the information you provide for statistical or research purposes only, and will not disclose your information in identifiable form without your consent to anyone outside of the BJS project team. All personally identifiable data collected under BJS’s authority are protected under the confidentiality provisions of 42 U.S.C. § 3789g, and anyone who violates these provisions may be punished by a fine up to $10,000, in addition to any other penalties imposed by law. Further, the Cybersecurity Enhancement Act of 2015 (codified in relevant part at 6 U.S.C. § 151), federal information systems are protected from malicious activities through cybersecurity screening of transmitted data. For more information on the federal statutes, regulations, and other authorities that govern how BJS, BJS employees, and BJS data collection agents collect, handle, store, disseminate, and protect your information, see the BJS Data Protection Guidelines—(https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/BJS_Data_Protection_Guidelines.pdf).”

The following listing shows the current BJS Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) OMB numbers and information collection titles whose confidentiality pledges will change to reflect the statutory implementation of DHS’ Einstein 3A monitoring for cybersecurity protection purposes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OMB control No.</th>
<th>Information collection title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1121–0094 .....</td>
<td>Deaths in Custody Reporting Program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1121–0065 .....</td>
<td>National Corrections Reporting Program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affected Public: Survey respondents to applicable BJS information collections.

Total Respondents: Unchanged from current collection.

Frequency: Unchanged from current collection.

Total Responses: Unchanged from current collection.

Estimated Average Time per Response: Unchanged from current collection.

Estimated Total Cost: Unchanged from current collection.

BJS has also added information about the Cybersecurity Enhancement Act and Einstein 3A to the BJS Data Protection Guidelines to provide more details to interested respondents about the new cybersecurity monitoring requirements. The following text has been added to Section V. Information System Security and Privacy Requirements:

“The Cybersecurity Enhancement Act of 2015 (codified in relevant part at 6 U.S.C. § 151) required the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) to provide cybersecurity protection for federal civilian agency information technology systems and to conduct cybersecurity screening of the Internet traffic going in and out of these systems to look for viruses, malware, and other cybersecurity threats. DHS has implemented this requirement by instituting procedures such that, if a potentially malicious malware signature were found, the Internet packets that contain the malware signature would be further inspected, pursuant to any required legal process, to identify and mitigate the cybersecurity threat. In accordance with the Act’s provisions, DHS conducts these cybersecurity screening activities solely to protect federal information and information systems from cybersecurity risks. To comply with the Act’s requirements and to increase the protection of information from cybersecurity threats, OJP facilitates, through the DOJ Trusted Internet Connection and DHS’s EINSTEIN 3A system, the inspection of all information transmitted to and from OJP systems including, but not limited to, respondent data collected and maintained by BJS.”

The Census Bureau collects data on behalf of BJS for BJS’s National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) and its supplements. These collections are protected under Title 13 U.S.C. Section 9. The Census Bureau issued a Federal Register notice (FRN) to revise its confidentiality pledge language to address the new cybersecurity screening...
requirements (new line bolded for reference only):

“...The U.S. Census Bureau is required by law to protect your information. The Census Bureau is not permitted to publicly release your responses in a way that could identify you. Per the Federal Cybersecurity Enhancement Act of 2015, your data are protected from cybersecurity risks through screening of the systems that transmit your data.”

The following listing includes the BJS information collections that are administered by the Census Bureau whose confidentiality pledge will be revised.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OMB control No.</th>
<th>Information collection title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1121–0111 ......</td>
<td>NCVS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1121–0184 ......</td>
<td>School Crime Supplement to the NCVS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1121–0317 ......</td>
<td>Identity Theft Supplement to the NCVS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1121–0260 ......</td>
<td>Police Public Contact Supplement to the NCVS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1121–0302 ......</td>
<td>Supplemental Victimization Survey to the NCVS.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affected Public: Survey respondents to applicable BJS information collections.

Total Respondents: Unchanged from current collection.

Frequency: Unchanged from current collection.

Total Responses: Unchanged from current collection.

Average Time per Response: Unchanged from current collection.

Estimated Total Burden Hours: Unchanged from current collection.

Estimated Total Cost: Unchanged from current collection.

The 60-day FRN submitted by the Census Bureau can be accessed at https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2016/12/23/2016-30959/agency-information-collection-activities-request-for-comments-revision-of-the-confidentiality-pledge. The Census Bureau is currently reviewing and preparing responses to the comments it received and will publish a 30-day FRN to solicit additional public comment. Comments on the Census Bureau’s revised confidentiality pledge should be submitted directly to the point-of-contact listed in the notice.

III. Data

OMB Control Number: 1121–0358.

Legal Authority: 44 U.S.C. 3506(e) and 42 U.S.C. 3789g.

Form Number(s): None.

IV. Request for Comments

Comments are invited on the efficacy of BJS’s revised confidentiality pledge above. Comments submitted in response to this notice will become a matter of public record. BJS received one comment during the 60-day notice period. The commenter questioned why BJS chose not to specifically reference who (cybersecurity personnel, or DHS personnel) would conduct the cybersecurity screening activities authorized by the Cybersecurity Act of 2015. BJS responded with information about the process it followed to revise the confidentiality pledge, including using the results of pretesting that other statistical agencies conducted on different versions of revised language and coordinating with OJP’s Office of General Counsel to ensure that the new pledge language fulfills BJS’s statutory obligation to inform respondents that their data may be accessed by others for non-statistical purposes. BJS also directed the commenter to the information added to the BJS Data Protection guidelines (Section V. Information System Security and Privacy Requirements) that provides more details about the Act and the associated monitoring activities. BJS is not proposing edits to its confidentiality pledge, though it will consider conducting pretesting activities on its various respondent populations and developing more detailed guidance for staff and contractors on how to answer respondents’ questions about the Act.

If additional information is required contact: Melody Braswell, Department Clearance Officer, United States Department of Justice, Justice Management Division, Policy and Planning Staff, Two Constitution Square, 145 N Street NE., 3E.405A, Washington, DC 20530.


Melody Braswell,
Department Clearance Officer for PRA, U.S. Department of Justice.

[FR Doc. 2017–10345 Filed 5–19–17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–18–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employee Benefits Security Administration

Proposed Extension of Information Collection Requests Submitted for Public Comment

AGENCY: Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of Labor (the Department), in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA), provides the general public and Federal agencies with an opportunity to comment on proposed and continuing collections of information. This helps the Department assess the impact of its information collection requirements and minimize the public’s reporting burden. It also helps the public understand the Department’s information collection requirements and provide the requested data in the desired format. The Employee Benefits Security Administration (EBSA) is soliciting comments on the proposed extension of the information collection requests (ICRs) contained in the documents described below. A copy of the ICRs may be obtained by contacting the office listed in the ADDRESSES section of this notice. ICRs are also available at reginfo.gov (http://www.reginfo.gov/public/do/PRAMain).

DATES: Written comments must be submitted to the office shown in the Addresses section on or before July 21, 2017.

ADDRESSES: G. Christopher Cosby, Department of Labor, Employee Benefits Security Administration, 200 Constitution Avenue NW., Room N–5718, Washington, DC 20210, ebsa.opr@ dol.gov, (202) 693–8410, FAX (202) 693–4745 (these are not toll-free numbers).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This notice requests public comment on the Department’s request for extension of the Office of Management and Budget’s (OMB) approval of ICRs contained in the rules and prohibited transaction exemptions described below. The Department is not proposing any changes to the existing ICRs at this time. An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, an information collection unless it displays a valid OMB control number. A summary of the ICRs and the current burden estimates follows:

Agency: Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor.

Title: Prohibited Transaction Exemption (PTE) 81–8 for Investment of Plan Assets in Certain Types of Short-Term Investments.

Type of Review: Extension of a currently approved collection of information.

OMB Number: 1210–0061.

Affected Public: Businesses or other for-profits, Not-for-profit institutions.

Respondents: 65,000.

Responses: 325,000.

Estimated Total Burden Hours: 81,000.

Estimated Total Burden Cost (Operating and Maintenance): $99,000.

Description: PTE 81–8 permits the investment of plan assets that involve